SRI PRATAP COLLEGE
SRINAGAR
LIBRARY

Class No.
Book No.
Accession No. 2086

TO THE READER.

KINDLY use this book very carefully. If the book is disfigured or marked or written on while in your possession the book will have to be replaced by a new copy or paid for. In case the book be a volume of set which single volume is not available the price of the whole set will be realized.

SRI PRATAP COLLEGE,
SRINAGAR.
LIBRARY

Class No. 825
Book No. C 667
Accession No. 1375

SRI PRATAP COLLEGE
SRINAGAR
LIBRARY

Class No. _____
Book No. _____
Accession No. _____

THE

TREASURY OF BRITISH ELOQUENCE

SPECIMENS

OF BRILLIANT ORATIONS BY THE MOST EMINENT

STATESMEN, DIVINES, ETC.

OF GREAT BRITAIN

OF THE LAST FOUR CENTURIES

WITH BIOGRAPHICAL AND CRITICAL NOTICES

AND INDEX

Compiled and Arranged by

ROBERT COCHRANE

EDITOR OF THE "ENGLISH ESSAYISTS," ETC.

EDINBURGH:

W. P. NIMMO, HAY, & MITCHELL

825
C88T 1375

"Speak the speech, I pray you, as I pronounced it to you, trippingly on the tongue. . . . Be not too tame neither, but let your own discretion be your tutor; suit the action to the word, the word to the action; with this special observance, that you o'erstep not the modesty of nature."—HAMLET TO THE PLAYERS.

"Eloquence, in this empire, is power. Give a man nerve, a presence, sway over languages, and, above all, enthusiasm, or the skill to simulate it; start him in the public arena with these requisites, and ere many years, perhaps many months, have passed, you will either see him in high station, or in a fair way of rising to it. . . . Unless you have the art of clothing your ideas in clear and captivating diction, of identifying yourself with the feelings of your hearers, and uttering them in languages more forcible, or terse, or brilliant, than they can themselves command; or unless you have the power—still more rare—of originating, of commanding their intellects, their hearts, of drawing them in your train by the irresistible magic of sympathy—of making their thoughts your thoughts, or your thoughts theirs, . . . never hope to rule your fellow-men in these modern days."—G. H. FRANCIS IN "ORATORS OF THE AGE."

"To be a great orator does not require the highest faculties of the human mind, but it requires the highest exertion of the common faculties of our nature. He has no occasion to dive into the depths of science, or to soar aloft on angels' wings. He keeps upon the surface, he stands firm upon the ground, but his form is majestic, and his eye sees far and near; he moves among his fellows, but he moves among them as a giant among common men. He has no need to read the heavens, to unfold the system of the universe, or create new worlds for the delighted fancy to dwell in; it is enough that he sees things as they are; that he knows and feels and remembers the common circumstances and daily transactions that are passing in the world around him. He is not raised above others by being superior to the common interests, prejudices, and passions of mankind, but by feeling them in a more intense degree than they do."—WILLIAM HAZLITT.

Gentlemen if you read this book.
read it. But stick it not, steal it not
and wear it not. It is not becoming in the
You Hon. Gentlemen. Ay.

PREFACE.

AMONGST the multitude of speeches, sermons, and addresses annually delivered in the United Kingdom, only a few are permanently preserved. As Charles Dickens once remarked, "No sooner do the leaves begin to fall from the trees than pearls of great price begin to fall from the lips of the wise men of the east, and north, and west, and south; and anybody may have them by the bushel for the picking up." That many of these pearls are worth picking up and re-setting no one will doubt. The curtain of oblivion will fall soon enough over the remainder. But when utterances are given by men who express the mind of the time, lend a stimulus to every good and great enterprise, speak in language generally understood and clothed with grace and truthfulness, we have here one plea for their preservation.

Some may hear a great orator and find both stimulus and refreshment in his words; but he serves a much higher purpose than this. The impartial student, when he has read and mastered the history of his own country as written by the ordinary historian, may yet be very far from any direct illumination as to the ordinary life of the people, and the hidden springs and motives which led to a certain national or individual course of action. In many cases he has been dealing with but the outer life of the time, and with generalities. He requires something which will give life and reality to his knowledge, and this he may find in a correct acquaintance with the life of a particular period, as found in its eloquence, or in its statute-books. It is here that the utterances of the divines and statesmen will commend themselves to the mind of the

student. They have had their share in moulding the national life. They are now exponents to us through the printed page, as they were face to face with the men of their own age—of the common passions and tendencies of their times, and as such their utterances are of high historical value. The reader may here glean some of the important facts of history, and the mind of the time, not as these appeared to some remote historian who unconsciously carries into his work many prejudices and preconceived notions. Here also he finds the very words of the men who were actors in, and who helped to make the history of the country. Their words found, and may still find, an echo in the life of the nation; they were thrilled through and through with the forces and vitalities of their age; and by their words they helped to mould the destinies of coming generations. As they were true to the realities of religion, of the national and individual life, so will the force and permanence of their speaking be. Read in this light we are not in a position to despise the orators of our country. In this way, perhaps, Carlyle has termed his biography of Oliver Cromwell "The Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell."

Although correct parliamentary reporting, as a system, was not fully organised until after 1815, yet we have many notable speeches preserved to us of a much earlier date. In the time of Sir John Eliot (1590-1632), and much later, it was common for speakers in Parliament to impart their speeches to their friends, who caused them to be transcribed. In this way parliamentary intelligence was circulated in MS. to certain parts of the kingdom where otherwise it might never have reached. Lord Macaulay tells us that in 1685 the newspaper, for the most part, consisted of perhaps a royal proclamation, two or three formal addresses or notices of promotion, a description of a highwayman, of a cock-fight, or an advertisement regarding a strayed dog. The most important parliamentary debates and State trials were passed over in profound silence. In the way already mentioned private notes were kept of Queen Elizabeth's Parliaments, of those of James I. and II., and of the Long Parlia-

ment. The *Gentleman's Magazine*, in August 1735, began to give a monthly synopsis of the debates in Parliament. These debates are said to have been done for this magazine from 1740 to 1743 by Dr Johnson, who, with his well-known political bias, "took care that the Whig dogs should not have the best of it." Thirty years after this time the same plan was adopted by the newspapers. Still in the earlier part of this volume the pulpit is perhaps best represented, owing to the scarcity of reported speeches.

The leading idea in the present compilation has been to furnish specimens of the speeches, sermons, and addresses of some of the greatest statesmen, divines, and others, of the last four centuries, arranged in chronological order, with brief biographies and notes. The term eloquence has been limited to spoken utterances, otherwise the field might have been practically limitless. The specimens given are sought to be either interesting in themselves, or as read in the light of history. For example, the progress of the Eastern Question may be traced from the allusion of Latimer (p. 17), that "thou shalt first kill the great Turks, and discomfort and thrust them down," through the speeches of Fox, R. L. Sheil, on to the statesmen of recent times. Considerable space has been given to the great speeches of Edmund Burke, William Pitt, Sheridan, Brougham, Disraeli, Gladstone, etc. The great divines will also be found well represented. It was the advice of a noted speaker to a young orator that he should deeply meditate on the "beauties of our old English authors, the poets, the moralists, and perhaps more than all these, the preachers of the Augustan age of English letters." The speeches of Sir John Eliot and Cromwell, of Lord Belhaven on the union between England and Scotland, throw light on special periods of the history of our country. The great lawyers are also represented. The addresses of Lord Lytton, Carlyle, Maurice, J. A. Froude, etc., on literary and educational topics, from the eminence of the speakers, not less than the intrinsic merit of the utterances, will be found worthy of all attention. Although seventy-four names are included, yet fully to represent the great

speakers in the political, legal, or ecclesiastical world, was impossible in the present case, even had it been desirable. The Editor is aware, that had the volume been twice its present size only relative completeness would have been gained. The length of the specimens is in no sense intended to be representative of the eminence or public worth of the speakers. Through want of space and other reasons some names have been omitted, which, as originally intended, would have found a place in the collection. These omissions, it is hoped, however, are both few and unimportant. Except in the case of Jeremy Taylor, whose sermons are overloaded with classical allusions, no liberties have been taken with the text, which stands as given by the best authorities. In the preparation of the earlier part of the volume, Dr Goodrich's "Select British Eloquence" has been freely drawn upon.

The best thanks of Publisher and Compiler are here accorded to those authors or publishers who have very kindly permitted the use of much copyright matter,—to Dean Stanley, Mr J. A. Froude, and Rev. C. H. Spurgeon; to Messrs Longman & Co., Macmillan & Co., Henry S. King and Co., Daldy, Isbister, & Co., and Messrs Passmore & Alabaster.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

HUGH LATIMER.
The Ploughers, ... 9
What Card to Play, ... 16

JOHN KNOX.
Prayer, ... 18

JOHN JEWELL.
The Holy Communion and the Mass, . 26

RICHARD HOOKER.
The Certainty and Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect, ... 30

JOHN DONNE.
Heaven, ... 35
Seeing God, ... 36
Sin, ... 37
The Elect, ... 41

JOSEPH HALL.
God's Vineyard, ... 42
Fashions of the World, ... 43
Life a Sojourning, ... 43

SIR JOHN ELIOT.
Religion and the State, ... 44
National Grievances and the Impeachment of Buckingham, ... 45
State of the Nation, ... 48

THOMAS WENTWORTH.
Speech when Impeached for High Treason before the House of Lords, April 13, 1641, ... 49

OLIVER CROMWELL.
State of the Nation, ... 51
On Dissolving Parliament, 1658, . . 63

THOMAS FULLER.
How far Examples are to be followed, . 64
An ill Match well Broken off, . . 67

JEREMY TAYLOR.
The Marriage Ring; or, the Mysteriousness and Duties of Marriage, . . 70

ROBERT LEIGHTON.
Divine Grace and Holy Obedience, . 80
Exhortations to Candidates for the Degree of Master of Arts, ... 84

RICHARD BAXTER.
Right Rejoicing, ... 87
Now or Never, ... 88

ISAAC BARROW.
Goodness, ... 90
Prayer, ... 91
Incitements to Industry, ... 91

JOHN TILLOTSON.
The Dignity of Man, ... 92
Doing Good, ... 93

ROBERT SOUTH.
Friendships Human and Divine, . . 96
Man at the Mercy of Fortune, . . 97

LORD BELHAVEN.
The Legislative Union of England and Scotland, ... 98

PAGE

FRANCIS ATTERBURY.
Speech before the House of Lords, May 11, 1723, ... 103
Church Music, ... 105

JONATHAN SWIFT.
The Doctrine of the Trinity, . . . 107

SIR ROBERT WALPOLE.
On a Motion for Addressing the King for his Removal, ... 109

WILLIAM PULTENEY.
On a Motion for Reducing the Army, . 116

LORD CHESTERFIELD.
The Gin Act, ... 117

PHILIP DODDRIDGE.
Capernaum, ... 123
On seeing Him that is Invisible, . . 124

JOHN WESLEY.
Free Grace, ... 127

LORD MANSFIELD.
Speech when surrounded by a Mob in the Court of the King's Bench, on a Trial respecting the Outlawry of John Wilkes, ... 133
On a Bill to deprive Peers of Certain Privileges, ... 134

LORD CHATHAM.
Against Search-Warrants for Seamen, . 136
Reply when Attacked by Horatio Walpole, 138
On an Address to the Throne, in which the Right of Taxing America is Discussed, ... 139
On a Motion for an Address to the Throne, 144

LAURENCE STERNE.
The House of Feasting and the House of Mourning Described, ... 149

GEORGE WHITEFIELD.
The Wise and Foolish Virgins, . . 152

HUGH BLAIR.
On Gentleness, ... 160

JOHN WILKES.
Representation of the People, . . 165

EDMUND BURKE.
Protestant Dissenters' Relief Bill, . . 169
American Taxation, ... 174
On Conciliation with America, . . 197
Speech Previous to Bristol Election, . 222
Speech Declining Election, ... 239

LORD THURLOW.
Reply to the Duke of Richmond, . . 240

CHARLES JAMES FOX.
The Russian Armament, ... 241

JOHN PHILPOT CURRAN.
A Vindication of Irish Parliamentary Reform, ... 254

HENRY GRATTAN.
On Moving a Declaration of Irish Right, 256
Invective against Mr Corry, ... 257

PAGE

LORD ERSKINE.
Speech in behalf of John Stockdale, . 259
Speech against Thomas Williams for the Publication of Paine's "Age of Reason,". 259

RICHARD BRINSLEY SHERIDAN.
On summing up the Evidence on the Second or Begum Charge against Warren Hastings, ... 262

WILLIAM PITT.
On the Abolition of the Slave Trade, . 292
The Rupture of the Negotiations for Peace with France, ... 305

WILLIAM WILBERFORCE.
To the Electors of Hull, . . . 306

ROBERT HALL.
The Advantages of Knowledge to the Lower Classes, ... 307
On the Threatened Invasion of Britain by the French in 1803, . . . 313

WILLIAM COBBETT.
On Reform and Reformers, . . . 314

EARL GREY.
On Moving the Second Reading of the Reform Bill, 1832, ... 316

LORD PLUNKET.
On the Prosecution of Emmett, 1803, . 317

SIR JAMES MACKINTOSH.
Defence of Jean Peltier, . . . 318
Character of Charles J. Fox, . . . 319

GEORGE CANNING.
The Fall of Bonaparte, ... 321
On Parliamentary Reform, 1820, . . 326
Right Policy of Britain, . . . 327

SYDNEY SMITH.
The House of Lords and the Reform Bill, 328

LORD LYNDHURST.
Review of the Session of 1836, . . 329

DANIEL O'CONNELL.
Colonial Slavery, 1831, ... 331
The Irish Disturbances Bill, 1833, . . 331

LORD BROUGHAM.
Inaugural Discourse at Glasgow, 1825, . 332
Law Reform, ... 341
Parliamentary Reform, ... 342

DR ANDREW THOMSON.
Slave Emancipation, ... 343
Infidelity, ... 345

THOMAS CHALMERS.
On the Sympathy that is felt for Man in the Distant Places of Creation, . 346
The Flight of Time, ... 351

LORD PALMERSTON.
British Foreign Policy, 1850, . . . 352

SIR ROBERT PEEL.
Speech at Tamworth, 1835, . . . 353

EDWARD IRVING.
Serving God in the Household, . . 355
Extracts: God's Goodness to Man, 361—The Creation of Man, 362—The Bible Neglected, 362—The Press and the Pulpit, 362—Emblems of Heaven, 362—God can Create another World fairer than this, 363—The Growing Character of a Servant of God. 363—Knowledge and Liberality of Mind, 363.

PAGE

THOMAS CARLYLE.
Address to the Students of the University of Edinburgh, 1866, . . . 364

LORD JOHN RUSSELL.
The Reform Bill of 1831-32, . . . 375

RICHARD LALOR SHEIL.
The State of Ireland, ... 376
Russian and Turkish Treaties, . . 376

EARL OF DERBY.
The Dissolution of Parliament, . . 381

LORD MACAULAY.
On Copyright, ... 383

THOMAS GUTHRIE.
The City, its Sins and Sorrows, . . 386

RICHARD COBDEN.
Free Trade, ... 394
The War with Russia, ... 396

LORD LYTTON.
Address to the Associated Societies of the University of Edinburgh, . . 402

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE.
On the Friendship of Books, . . . 410
Edmund Burke, ... 418

LORD BEACONSFIELD.
The Irish Church, ... 427
The Pursuit of Knowledge, . . . 433
Speech to the Glasgow Conservative Association, ... 438

W. E. GLADSTONE.
The Established Church in Ireland, . 445
Preaching, ... 466
Russia and Turkey, ... 469

JOHN BRIGHT.
The Crimean War, ... 470
The Burials Bill, ... 480
Peace and War, an Address given at Llandudno, Nov. 22, 1876, . . 482

CHARLES DICKENS.
Selected Addresses delivered on Various Occasions: At Edinburgh, 488—At Boston, 489—At Hartford, U.S., 490—At New York, 492—At the Annual Meeting of the Institutional Association of Lancashire and Cheshire, 1858, 494.

NORMAN MACLEOD, D.D.
Missions to India, ... 497

DEAN STANLEY.
St Paul, ... 500
St John, ... 502
The Hopes of Theology, . . . 503

F. W. ROBERTSON.
The Sympathy of Christ, . . . 504
Wordsworth, ... 507

J. B. GOUGH.
The Cause of Temperance, . . . 509
Social Responsibilities, ... 510

J. A. FROUDE.
Education, ... 511

CHARLES KINGSLEY.
Heaven on Earth, ... 522
The Education of Women, . . . 523

C. H. SPURGEON.
Sermons—their Matter, ... 524

BIOGRAPHIES, ... 527

INDEX, ... 543

THE

TREASURY OF BRITISH ELOQUENCE.

HUGH LATIMER.

1490-1555.

THE PLOUGHERS.*

"ALL things which are written are written for our erudition and knowledge. All things that are written in God's book, in the Bible book, in the book of the Holy Scripture, are written to be our doctrine."

I told you in my first sermon, honourable audience, that I purposed to declare unto you two things. The one, what seed should be sown in God's field, in God's plough land; and the other, who should be the sowers. That is to say, what doctrine is to be taught in Christ's church and congregation, and what men should be the teachers and preachers of it. The first part I have told you in the three sermons past, in which I have essayed to set forth my plough, to prove what I could do. And now I shall tell you who be the ploughers; for God's Word is a seed to be sown in God's field—that is, the faithful congregation—and the preacher is the sower. And it is in the Gospel—*Exivit qui seminat seminare semen suum* ["A sower went out to sow his seed" (Luke viii. 5)]. He that soweth, the husbandman, the ploughman, went forth to sow his seed; so that the preacher is resembled to a ploughman, as it is in another place—*Nemo admota arato manu, et a tergo respiciens aptus est regno Dei* ["No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God" (Luke ix. 62)]. No man that putteth his hand to the plough, and looketh back, is apt for the kingdom of God. That is to say, let no preacher be negligent in doing his office. Albeit this is one of the places that hath been racked, as I told you of racking Scriptures. And I have been one of them myself that hath racked it; I cry God mercy for it, and have been one of them that have believed and have expounded it against religious persons that would forsake their order which they had professed, and would go out of their cloister, whereas, indeed, it toucheth not monkery, nor maketh anything at all for any such matter. But it is directly spoken of diligent preaching of the Word of God. For preaching of the Gospel is one of God's plough works, and the preacher is one of God's ploughmen. Ye may not be offended with my similitude, in that I compare preaching to the labour and work of ploughing, and the preacher to a ploughman. Ye may not be offended with this my similitude, for I have been slandered of some persons for such things. It hath been said of me—"O Latimer! nay, as for him, I will never believe him while I live, nor never trust him, for he likened our blessed Lady to a saffron bag," where, indeed, I never used that similitude. But it was, as I have said unto you before now, according to that which Peter saw before in the spirit of prophecy, and said that there should come afterward men—*Per quos via veritatis maledictis afficeretur* ["By reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of" (2 Peter ii. 2)]. There should come fellows by whom the way of truth should be evil spoken of and slandered. But in case I had used this similitude, it had not been to be re-

---

* *Quecumque scripta sunt ad nostram doctrinam scripta sunt* ["Whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning" (Rom. xv. 4)]. Preached at the Shrouds, St Paul's, January 18, 1549.

"What a merry wit he has! What a kind and loving heart! How his daily fighting with craft has made him a subtle spirit! What skill he has in fence and parry! How he relishes the telling of a good story! Dauntless, incorruptible, despising wealth, except as the instrument of charity; an enthusiastic social reformer, as well as a godly teacher; a lover of the people, Hugh Latimer stands there and expounds unto them who be 'The Ploughers.'"—*Edward Arber.*

proved, but might have been without reproach. For I might have said thus, as the saffron bag that hath been full of saffron, or hath had saffron in it, doth ever after savour and smell of the sweet saffron that it contained, so our blessed Lady, who contained and bare Christ in her womb, did ever after resemble the manners and virtues of that precious babe which she bare. And what had our blessed Lady been the worse for this? or what dishonour was this to our blessed Lady? But as preachers must be wary and circumspect that they give not any just occasion to be slandered and ill spoken of by the hearers, so must not the auditors be offended without cause. For heaven is in the Gospel likened to a mustard seed. It is compared also to a piece of leaven; and Christ saith that at the last day, He will come like a thief; and what dishonour is this to God? or what derogation is this to heaven? Ye may not then, I say, be offended with my similitude, for because I liken preaching to a ploughman's labour, and a prelate to a ploughman. But now, you will ask me whom I call a prelate. A prelate is that man, whatsoever he be, that hath a flock to be taught of him, whosoever hath any spiritual charge in the faithful congregation, and whosoever he be that hath cure of souls.

And well may the preacher and the ploughman be likened together. First, for their labour of all seasons of the year; for there is no time of the year in which the ploughman hath not some special work to do; as in my country in Leicestershire, the ploughman hath a time to set forth and to assay his plough, and other times for other necessary works to be done. And then they also may be likened together, for the diversity of works and variety of offices that they have to do. For as the ploughman first setteth forth his plough, and then tilleth his land, and breaketh it in furrows, and sometimes ridgeth it up again; and at another time harroweth it, and clotteth it, and sometimes dungeth it, and hedgeth it, diggeth it, and weedeth it, purgeth it, and maketh it clean,—so the prelate, the preacher, hath many divers offices to do. He hath first a busy work to bring his parishioners to a right faith, as Paul calleth it, and not to a swearing faith, but to a faith that embraceth Christ, and trusteth to His merits; a lively faith, a justifying faith, a faith that maketh a man righteous without respect of works, as ye have it very well declared and set forth in the homily. He hath then a busy work to bring his flock to a right faith, and then to confirm them in the same faith; now casting them down with the law and with threatenings of God for sin; now ridging them up again with the Gospel, and with the promises of God's favour; now weeding them by telling them their faults, and making them forsake sin; now clotting them, by breaking their stony hearts, and by making them supple-hearted, and making them to have hearts of flesh—that is, soft hearts—and apt for doctrine to enter in; now teaching to know God rightly, and to know their duty to God and their neighbours; now exhorting them when they know their duty, that they do it, and be diligent in it—so that they have a continual work to do. Great is their business, and therefore great should be their hire. They have great labours, and therefore they ought to have good livings, that they may commodiously feed their flock; for the preaching of the Word of God unto the people is called meat—Scripture calleth it meat; not strawberries, that come but once a year, and tarry not long, but are soon gone, but it is meat. It is no dainties. The people must have meat that must be familiar and continual, and daily given unto them to feed upon. Many make a strawberry of it, ministering it but once a year; but such do not the office of good prelates. For Christ saith —*Quis putas est servus prudens et fidelis? qui dat cibum in tempore* ["Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season" (Matt. xxiv. 45)]. Who, think you, is a wise and faithful servant? He that giveth meat in due time. So that he must at all times convenient preach diligently. "Therefore," saith He, "who trow you is a faithful servant?" He speaketh it as though it were a rare thing to find such a one, and as though He should say, there be but few of them to find in the world. And how few of them there be throughout this realm that give meat to their flock as they should do; the visitors can best tell. Too few, too few—the more is the pity, and never so few as now. By this, then, it appeareth that a prelate, or any that hath cure of souls, must diligently and substantially work and labour. Therefore saith Paul to Timothy—*Qui episcopatum desiderat, hic bonum opus desiderat* ["If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work" (1 Tim. iii. 1)]. He that desireth to have the office of a bishop, or a prelate, that man desireth a good work. Then if it be good work, it is work. Ye can make but a work of it. It is God's work—God's plough, and that plough God would have still going. Such, then, as loiter and live idly are not good prelates or ministers. And of such as do not preach and teach, nor do not their duties, God saith by His prophet Jeremiah—*Maledictus qui facit opus Dei fraudulenter* ["Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully" (Jer. xlviii. 10)]. Guilefully or deceitfully; some books have *negligenter*—negligently, or slackly. How many such prelates, how many such bishops, Lord, for Thy mercy, are there now in England? And what shall we, in this case, do? Shall we company with them? O Lord! for Thy mercy, shall we not company with them? O Lord! whither shall we fly from them? But cursed be he that doeth the work of God negligently or guilefully. A sore word for them that are negli-

gent in discharging their office, or have done it fraudulently, for that is the thing that maketh the people ill. But true it must be that Christ saith—*Multi sunt vocati, pauci vero electi* ["Many are called, but few are chosen" (Matt. xxii. 14)].

Here have I an occasion, by the way, somewhat to say unto you, yea, for the place that I alleged unto you before, out of Jeremiah the forty-eighth chapter. And it was spoken of a spiritual work of God—a work that was commanded to be done, and it was of shedding blood, and of destroying the cities of Moab. "For," saith he, "cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from shedding of blood" (Jer. xlviii. 10). As Saul, when he kept back the sword from shedding of blood, at what time he was sent against Amalek, was refused of God, for being disobedient to God's commandments, in that he spared Agag the king. So that that place of the prophet was spoken of them that went to the destruction of the cities of Moab, among the which there was one called Nebo, which was much reproved for idolatry, superstition, pride, avarice, cruelty, tyranny, and for hardness of heart, and for these sins was plagued of God, and destroyed. Now, what shall we say of these rich citizens of London? What shall I say of them? Shall I call them proud men of London, malicious men of London, merciless men of London? No, no! I may not say so; they will be offended with me then. Yet must I speak. For is there not reigning in London as much pride, as much covetousness, as much cruelty, as much oppression, as much superstition, as was in Nebo?- Yes, I think, and much more too. Therefore, I say, Repent, O London! repent, repent! Thou hearest thy faults told thee; amend them, amend them. I think if Nebo had had the preaching that thou hast, they would have converted And you, rulers and officers, be wise and circumspect; look to your charge, and see you do your duties, and rather be glad to amend your ill living, than to be angry when you are warned or told of your fault. What ado there was made in London at a certain man, because he said, and indeed, at that time, on a just cause—"Burgesses," quoth he, "nay, butterflies." Lord! what ado there was for that word! And yet, would God they were no worse than butterflies. Butterflies do but their nature; the butterfly is not covetous, is not greedy of other men's goods, is not full of envy and hatred, is not malicious, is not cruel, is not merciless. The butterfly glorieth not in her own deeds, nor preferreth the traditions of men before God's Word; it committeth not idolatry, nor worshippeth false gods. But London cannot abide to be rebuked; such is the nature of man. If they be pricked, they will kick. If they be rubbed on the gall, they will wince. But yet they will not amend their faults; they will not be evil spoken of. But how shall I speak well of them? If you could be content to receive and follow the Word of God, and favour good preachers—if you could bear to be told of your faults—if you could amend when you hear of them—if you would be glad to reform that is amiss—if I might see any such inclination in you, that leave to be merciless, and begin to be charitable, I would then hope well of you, I would then speak well of you. But London was never so evil as it is now. In times past, men were full of pity and compassion, but now there is no pity, for in London their brother shall die in the streets for cold; he shall lie sick at their door, between stock and stock—I cannot tell what to call it—and perish there for hunger. Was there any more unmercifulness in Nebo? I think not. In times past, when any rich man died in London, they were wont to help the poor scholars of the university with exhibitions. When any man died, they would bequeath great sums of money toward the relief of the poor. When I was a scholar in Cambridge myself, I heard very good report of London, and knew many that had relief of the rich men of London; but now, I can hear no such good report, and yet I inquire of it, and hearken for it, but now charity is waxed cold; none helpeth the scholar, nor yet the poor. And in those days, what did they when they helped the scholars? Many they maintained and gave them languages, that were very papists, and professed the Pope's doctrine; and now that the knowledge of God's Word is brought to light, and many earnestly study and labour to set it forth, now almost no man helpeth to maintain them. O London, London! repent, repent! for I think God is more displeased with London than ever He was with the city of Nebo. Repent, therefore, repent, London! and remember that the same God liveth now that punished Nebo, even the same God, and none other, and He will punish sin as well now as He did then, and He will punish the iniquity of London as well as He did then of Nebo. Amend, therefore, and ye that be prelates, look well to your office; for right prelating is busy labouring, and not lording. Therefore preach and teach, and let your plough be doing; ye lords, I say, that live like loiterers, look well to your office; the plough is your office and charge. If you live idle and loiter, you do not your duty, you follow not your vocation; let your plough, therefore, be going and not cease, that the ground may bring forth fruit. But now, methinketh I hear one say unto me—"Wot you what you say? Is it a work? Is it a labour? How then hath it happened that we have had so many hundred years so many unpreaching prelates, lording loiterers, and idle ministers?" Ye would have me here to make answer, and to show the cause thereof. Nay, this land is not for me to plough; it is too stony, too thorny, too hard for me to plough. They have so many things that make for them, so many things to lay for themselves, that it is

not for my weak team to plough them. They have to lay for themselves long customs, ceremonies, and authority, placing in parliament, and many things more. And I fear me this land is not yet ripe to be ploughed. For, as the saying is, it lacketh weathering, this gear lacketh weathering; at least way, it is not for me to plough. But what shall I look for among thorns but pricking and scratching? What among stones but stumbling? What (I had almost said) among serpents but stinging? But this much I dare say, that since lording and loitering hath come up, preaching hath come down, contrary to the apostles' times. For they preached and lorded not. And now they lord and preach not.

For they that be lords will never go to plough. It is no meet office for them. It is not seeming for their state. Thus come up lording loiterers. Thus crept in unpreaching prelates, and so have they long continued.

For how many unlearned prelates have we now at this day? And no marvel. For if the ploughmen that now be were made lords, they would clean give over ploughing, they would leave off their labour and fall to lording outright, and let the plough stand. And then, both ploughs not walking, nothing should be in the commonweal but hunger. For ever since the prelates were made lords and nobles, the plough standeth. There is no work done; the people starve.

They hawk, they hunt, they card, they dice, they pastime in their prelacies with gallant gentlemen, with their dancing minions, and with their fresh companions, so that ploughing is set aside. And by the lording and loitering, preaching and ploughing is clean gone. And thus, if the ploughmen of the country were as negligent in their office as prelates be, we should no longer live, for lack of sustenance. And as it is necessary for to have the ploughing for the sustentation of the body, so must we have also the other for the satisfaction of the soul, or else we cannot live long ghostly. For as the body wasteth and consumeth away for lack of bodily meat, so doth the soul pine away for default of ghostly meat. But there be two kinds of enclosing to let or hinder both these kinds of ploughing. The one is an enclosing to let or hinder the bodily ploughing, and the other to let or hinder the holyday ploughing—the church ploughing. The bodily ploughing is taken in and enclosed through singular commodity. For what man will let go or diminish his private commodity for a commonwealth? and who will sustain any damage for the respect of a public commodity? The other plough also no man is diligent to set forward, nor no man will hearken to it; but to hinder and let it, all men's ears are open, yea, and a great many of this kind of ploughmen which are very busy, and would seem to be very good workmen. I fear me some be rather mock gospellers than faithful ploughmen. I know many myself that profess the Gospel, and live nothing thereafter. I know them, and have been conversant with some of them. I know them, and, I speak it with a heavy heart, there is as little charity and good living in them as in any other, according to that which Christ said in the Gospel to the great number of people that followed Him as though they had had an earnest zeal to His doctrine, whereas, indeed, they had it not—*Non qui vidistis signa, sed quia comedistis de panibus* ["Not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves" (John vi. 26)]. "Ye follow me," saith He, "not because ye have seen the signs and miracles that I have done, but because ye have eaten the bread and refreshed your bodies." Therefore you follow me; so that I think many one nowadays professeth the Gospel for the living's sake, not for the love they bear to God's Word. But they that will be true ploughmen must work faithfully, for God's sake, for the edifying of their brethren. And as diligently as the husbandman plougheth for the sustentation of the body, so diligently must the prelates and ministers labour for the feeding of the soul; both the ploughs must still be doing, as most necessary for man. And wherefore are magistrates ordained, but the tranquillity of the commonweal may be confirmed, limiting both ploughs?

But now for the default of unpreaching prelates, methinks I could guess what might be said for excusing of them. They are so troubled with lordly living, they be so placed in palaces, couched in courts, ruffling in their rents, dancing in their dominions, burdened with ambassages, pampering of their paunches, like a monk that maketh his jubilee, munching in their mangers, and moiling in their gay manors and mansions, and so troubled with loitering in their lordships, that they cannot attend it. They are otherwise occupied; some in the king's matters; some are ambassadors; some of the Privy Council; some to furnish the court; some are lords of the Parliament; some are presidents; and some are comptrollers of mints. Well, well!

Is this their duty? Is this their office? Is this their calling? Should we have ministers of the Church to be comptrollers of the mint? Is this a meet office for a priest that hath cure of souls? Is this his charge? I would here ask one question. I would fain know who comptrolleth the devil at home at his parish while he comptrolleth the mint? If the apostles might not leave the office of preaching to be deacons, shall one leave it for minting?

I cannot tell you, but the saying is, that since priests have been minters, money hath been worse than it was before. And they say that the evilness of money hath made all things dearer. And in this behalf I must speak to England.

Hear, my country England, as Paul said in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, sixth chapter; for Paul was no sitting bishop, but a waik-

ing and a preaching bishop. But, when he went from them, he left there behind him the plough going still, for he wrote unto them and rebuked them for going to law and pleading their causes before heathen judges. "Is there," saith he, "utterly among you no wise man to be an arbitrator in matters of judgment? What! not one at all that can judge between brother and brother? But one brother go to law with another, and that under heathen judges." *Constituite contemptos qui sunt in ecclesia*, etc. ["Set them to judge who are least esteemed in the Church" (1 Cor. vi. 4)]. Appoint them judges that are most abject and vile in the congregation, which he speaketh in rebuking them; for, saith he, *Ad erubescenciam vestram dico.* ["I speak to your shame" (1 Cor. vi. 5)]. I speak it to your shame. So, England, I speak it to thy shame. Is there never a nobleman to be a lord president, but it must be a prelate? Is there never a wise man in the realm to be a comptroller of the mint? I speak it to your shame, I speak it to your shame. If there be never a wise man, make a water-bearer, a tinker, a cobbler, a slave, a page, comptroller of the mint. Make a mean gentleman, a groom, a yeoman, make a poor beggar lord president—thus I speak, not that I would have it so, but to your shame—if there be never a gentleman meet nor able to be lord president. For why are not the noblemen and young gentlemen of England so brought up in knowledge of God and in learning that they may be able to execute offices in the commonwealth? The king hath a great many wards, and I trow there is a court of wards, why is there not a school for the wards, as well as there is a court for their lands? Why are they not set in schools, where they may learn? Or why are they not sent to the universities, that they may be able to serve the king when they come to age? If the wards and young gentlemen were well brought up in learning and in the knowledge of God, they would not when they come of age so much give themselves to other vanities.

And if the nobility be well trained in godly learning, the people would follow the same train. For truly such as the noblemen be, such will the people be. And now the only cause why noblemen be not made lord presidents is because they have not been brought up in learning; therefore, for the love of God, appoint teachers and schoolmasters, you that have charge of youth, and give the teachers stipends worthy their pains, that they may bring them up in grammar, in logic, in rhetoric, in philosophy, in the civil law, and in that which I cannot leave unspoken of, the Word of God. Thanks be unto God, the nobility otherwise is very well brought up in learning and godliness, to the great joy and comfort of England, so that there is now good hope in the youth, that we shall another day have a flourishing commonwealth, considering their godly education. Yea, and there be already noblemen enough (though not so as I would wish) able to be lord presidents, and wise men enough for the mint. And as unmeet a thing it is for bishops to be lord presidents, or priests to be minters, as it was for the Corinthians to plead matters of variance before heathen judges. It is also a slander to the noblemen, as though they lacked wisdom and learning to be able for such offices, or else were no men of conscience, or else were not meet to be trusted, and able for such offices; and a prelate hath a charge and cure otherwise, and therefore he cannot discharge his duty and be a lord president too. For a presidentship requireth a whole man, and a bishop cannot be two men. A bishop hath his office, a flock to teach, to look unto, and therefore he cannot meddle with another office, which alone requireth a whole man. He should, therefore, give it over to whom it is meet, and labour in his own business, as Paul writeth to the Thessalonians—"Let every man do his own business, and follow his calling." Let the priest preach, and the nobleman handle the temporal matters. Moses was a marvellous man, a good man. Moses was a wonderful fellow, and did his duty, being a married man. We lack such as Moses was. Well, I would all men would look to their duty, as God hath called them, and then we should have a flourishing Christian commonwealth. And now I would ask a strange question. Who is the most diligent bishop and prelate in all England, that passeth all the rest in doing his office? I can tell, for I know him; who it is, I know him well. But now I think I see you listening and hearkening that I should name him. There is one that passeth all the others, and is the most diligent prelate and preacher in all England. And will ye know who it is? I will tell you. It is the devil. He is the most diligent preacher of all others; he is never out of his diocese; he is never from his cure; ye shall never find him unoccupied; he is ever in his parish; he keepeth residence at all times; ye shall never find him out of the way; call for him when you will, he is ever at home; the diligentest preacher in all the realm, he is ever at his plough; no lording nor loitering can hinder him; he is ever applying his business; ye shall never find him idle, I warrant you. And his office is to hinder religion, to maintain superstition, to set up idolatry, to teach all kinds of papistry; he is ready as can be wished for to set forth his plough, to devise as many ways as can be to deface and obscure God's glory. Where the devil is resident and hath his plough going, there away with books and up with candles, away with Bibles and up with beads, away with the light of the Gospel and up with the light of candles, yea, at noonday. Where the devil is resident, that he may prevail, up with all superstition and idolatry, censing, painting of images,

candles, palms, ashes, holy water, and new service of men's inventing, as though man could invent a better way to honour God with than God himself hath appointed. Down with Christ's cross, up with purgatory—pick-purse, up with him—the popish purgatory, I mean. Away with clothing the naked, the poor, and impotent, up with decking of images and gay garnishing of stocks and stones; up with man's traditions and his laws, down with God's traditions and His most holy Word; down with the old honour due to God, and up with the new god's honour. Let all things be done in Latin. There must be nothing but Latin, not as much as *Memento homo quod cinis es, et in cinerem reverteris* ("Remember, man, that thou art ashes, and into ashes thou shalt return"); which be the words that the minister speaketh to the ignorant people, when he giveth them ashes upon Ash-Wednesday, but it must be spoken in Latin. God's Word may in no wise be translated into English. Oh that our prelates would be as diligent to sow the corn of good doctrine as Satan is to sow cockle and darnel! And this is the devilish ploughing, the which worketh to have things in Latin, and letteth the fruitful edification. But here some man will say to me, "What, sir, are ye so privy of the devil's counsel that ye know all this to be true?" Truly I know him too well, and have obeyed him a little too much in condescending to some follies. And I know him as other men do, yea, that he is ever occupied and ever busy in following his plough. I know by St. Peter, who saith of him, *Sicut leo rugiens circuit querens quem devoret* ["As a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour" (1 Peter v. 8)]. He goeth about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour. I would have this text well viewed and examined every word of it. *Circuit*, he goeth about in every corner of his diocese. He goeth on visitation daily. He leaveth no place of his cure unvisited. He walketh round about from place to place, and ceaseth not. *Sicut leo*, as a lion, that is, strongly, boldly, and proudly, straightly, and fiercely, with high looks, with his proud countenances, with his stately braggings. *Rugiens*, roaring; for he letteth not slip any occasion to speak or to roar out when he seeth his time. *Querens*, he goeth about seeking and not sleeping, as our bishops do, but he seeketh diligently, he searcheth diligently all corners, whereas he may have his prey, he roveth abroad in every place of his diocese, he standeth not still, he is never at rest, but ever in hand with his plough, that it may go forward. But there was never such a preacher in England as he is. Who is able to tell his diligent preaching, who every day and every hour laboureth to sow cockle and darnel, that he may bring out of form and out of estimation and room,* the institution of the Lord's Supper and Christ's cross, for there he lost his right, for Christ said—*Nunc judicium est mundi, princeps seculi hujus ejicietur foras* ["Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the prince of this world be cast out" (John xii. 31)]; *Et sicut exultavit Moises serpentem in deserto, ita exaltari oportet filium hominis* ["And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up" (John iii. 14)]; *Et cum exaltatus fuero, a terra, omnia traham ad meipsum* ["And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me" (John xii. 32)]. Now is the judgment of this world, and the prince of this world shall be cast out. And as Moses did lift up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up. And when I shall be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all things unto myself. For the devil was disappointed of his purpose, for he thought all to be his own.

And when he had once brought Christ to the cross, he thought all cock sure. But there lost he all his reigning; for Christ said—*Omnia traham ad meipsum* ("I will draw all things to myself"). He meaneth drawing of man's soul to salvation. And that He said He would do *per semetipsum*, by His ownself, not by any other body's sacrifice. He meant by His own sacrifice on the cross, where He offered Himself for the redemption of mankind, and not the sacrifice of the mass to be offered by any other. For who can offer Him but Himself? He was both the offerer and the offering. And this is the prick, this is the mark at the which the devil shooteth, to evacuate the cross of Christ, and to mingle the institution of the Lord's Supper, the which, although he cannot bring to pass, yet he goeth about, by his sleight and subtle means, to frustrate the same; and these sixteen hundred years he hath been a doer, only purposing to evacuate Christ's death, and to make it of small efficacy and virtue.

For whereas Christ, according as the serpent was lifted up in the wilderness, so would He himself to be exalted, that thereby as many as trusted in Him should have salvation. But the devil would none of that. They would have us saved by a daily oblation propitiatory, by sacrifice expiatory, or remissory.

Now if I should preach in the country among the unlearned, I would tell what propitiatory, expiatory, and remissory is; but here is a learned auditory. Yet for them that be unlearned, I will expound it. Propitiatory, expiatory, remissory, or satisfactory, for they signify all one thing in effect, and is nothing else but a thing whereby to obtain remission of sins, and to have salvation. And this way the devil used to evacuate the death of Christ, that we might have affiance in other things; as in the daily sacrifice of the priest, whereas Christ would have us to trust in His only sacrifice. So He was *Agnus occisus ab origine mundi* ["The Lamb

* Place or office.

slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. xiii. 8)], the Lamb that hath been slain from the beginning of the world; and therefore He is called, *Juge sacrificium* ["A daily sacrifice" (Dan. viii. 11, 12)], a continual sacrifice, and not for the continuance of the mass, as the blanchers have blanched it, and wrested it, and as I myself did once mistake it. But Paul saith—*Per semetipsum purgatio facta* ["When He had by Himself purged our sins" (Heb. i. 3)], by Himself, and by none other, Christ made purgation and satisfaction for the whole world. Would Christ this word (by Himself) had been better weighed and looked upon, and *in sanctificationem*, to make them holy; for He is *Juge sacrificium*, a continual sacrifice, in effect, fruit, and operation, that like as they who, seeing the serpent hung up in the desert, were put in remembrance of Christ's death, in whom as many as believed were saved; so all men that trusted in the death of Christ shall be saved, as well they that were before as they that came after. For He was a continual sacrifice, as I said, in effect, fruit, operation, and virtue, as though He had from the beginning of the world, and continually should to the world's end, hang still on the cross; and He is as fresh hanging on the cross now, to them that believe and trust in Him, as He was fifteen hundred years ago when He was crucified. Then let us trust upon His only death, and look for none other sacrifice propitiatory, than the same bloody sacrifice, the lively sacrifice, and not a dry sacrifice, but a bloody sacrifice. For Christ himself said—*Consummatum est* ["It is finished" (John xix. 30)]. "It is perfectly finished. I have taken at my Father's hand the dispensation of redeeming mankind. I have wrought man's redemption, and have despatched the matter." Why then mingle ye Him? why do ye divide Him? Why make you of Him more sacrifices than one? Paul saith—*Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus* ["Christ our passover is sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. v. 7)], Christ our passover is offered up; so that the thing is done, and Christ hath done it, and He hath done it *semel*, once for all. And it was a bloody sacrifice, not a dry sacrifice.

Why, then, it is not the mass that availeth or profiteth for the quick or the dead! Woe worth thee, O devil! woe worth thee! thou hast prevailed so far and so long that thou hast made England to worship false gods, forsaking Christ their Lord. Woe worth thee, devil. Woe worth thee, devil, and all thine angels; if Christ by His death draweth all things to Himself, and draweth all men to salvation and to heavenly bliss that trust in Him, then the priests at the mass (at the Popish mass, I say), what can they draw when Christ draweth all, but lands and goods from the right heirs? The priests draw goods and riches, benefices and promotions to themselves; and such as believed in their sacrifice they draw to the devil. But Christ it is that draweth souls unto Him by His bloody sacrifice. What have we to do, then, but *Epulari in Domino* ["To eat the Lord's Supper" (1 Cor. xi. 20)], to eat in the Lord at His supper. What other service have we to do to Him? and what other sacrifice have we to offer, but the mortification of our flesh? What other oblation have we to make, but of obedience, of good living, of good works, and of helping our neighbours? But as for our redemption, it is done already, it cannot be better. Christ hath done that thing so well that it cannot be amended. It cannot be devised how to make that any better than He hath done it. But the devil, by the help of that Italian bishop yonder, his chaplain, hath laboured by all means that he might to frustrate the death of Christ and the merits of His passion. And they have devised for that purpose, to make us believe in other vain things by his pardons, as to have remission of sins for praying on hallowed beads; for drinking of the bakehouse bowl, as a canon of Waltham Abbey once told me, that whensoever they put their loaves of bread into the oven, as many as drank of the pardon bowl should have pardon for drinking of it. A mad thing to give pardon to a bowl. Then to Pope Alexander's holy water, to hallowed bells, palms, candles, ashes, and what not?

And of these things, every one hath taken away some part of Christ's sanctification. Every one hath robbed some part of Christ's passion and cross, and hath mingled Christ's death, and hath been made to be propitiatory and satisfactory, and to put away sin. Yea, and Alexander's holy water yet at this day remaineth in England, and is used as a remedy against spirits, and to chase away devils; yea, and I would this had been the worst. I would this were the worst. But woe worth thee, O devil, that hast prevailed to evacuate Christ's cross, and to mingle the Lord's Supper. These be the Italian bishop's devices, and the devil hath pricked at this mark to frustrate the cross of Christ; he shot at this mark long before Christ came, he shot at this prick four thousand years before Christ hanged on the cross, or suffered His passion.

For the brazen serpent was set up in the wilderness to put men in remembrance of Christ's coming, that like as they who beheld the brazen serpent were healed of their bodily diseases, so they that looked spiritually upon Christ that was to come, in Him should be saved spiritually from the devil. The serpent was set up in memory of Christ to come, but the devil found means to steal away the memory of Christ's coming, and brought the people to worship the serpent's self, and to cense him, to honour him, and to offer to him, to worship him, and to make an idol of him.

And this was done by the market men that I told you of.

And the clerk of the market did it for the lucre and advantage of his master, that thereby

his honour might increase, for by Christ's death he could have but small worldly advantage. And even now so hath he certain blanchers belonging to the market, to let and stop the light of the Gospel, and to hinder the king's proceedings in setting forth the Word and glory of God. And when the king's majesty, with the advice of his honourable council, goeth about to promote God's Word, and to set an order in matters of religion, there shall not lack blanchers that will say, "As for images, whereas they have been used to be censed, and to have candles offered unto them, none be so foolish to do it to the stock or stone, or to the image itself, but it is done to God and His honour before the image." And though they should abuse it, these blanchers will be ready to whisper the king in the ear, and to tell him that this abuse is but a small matter. And that the same, with all other like abuses in the Church, may be reformed easily. "It is but a little abuse," say they, "and it may be easily amended. But it should not be taken in hand at the first, for fear of trouble or further inconveniences,—the people will not bear sudden alterations: an insurrection may be made after sudden mutation, which may be to the great harm and loss of the realm. Therefore all things shall be well, but not out of hand, for fear of further business." These be the blanchers that hitherto have stopped the Word of God, and hindered the true setting forth of the same. There be so many put-offs, and so many put-byes, so many respects and considerations of worldly wisdom. And I doubt not but there were blanchers in the old time, to whisper in the ear of good King Hezekiah for the maintenance of idolatry done to the brazen serpent, as well as there hath been now of late, and be now, that can blanch the abuse of images and other like things. But good King Hezekiah would not be so blinded; he was like to Apollos, fervent in spirit. He would give no ear to the blanchers; he was not moved with these worldly respects, with these prudent considerations, with these policies; he feared not insurrections of the people. He feared not lest his people would not bear the glory of God; but he (without any of these respects, or policies, or considerations, like a good king, for God's sake, and for conscience sake) by-and-by plucked down the brazen serpent, and destroyed it utterly, and beat it to powder. He out of hand did cast down all images, he destroyed all idolatry, and clearly did extirpate all superstition. He would not hear these blanchers and worldly-wise men, but without delay followed God's cause, and destroyed all idolatry out of hand. Thus did good King Hezekiah; for he was like Apollos, fervent in spirit, and diligent to promote God's glory. And good hope there is that it shall be likewise here in England; for the king's majesty is so brought up in knowledge, virtue, and godliness, that it is not to be mistrusted but that we shall have all things well, and that the glory of God shall be spread abroad throughout all parts of the realm, if the prelates will diligently apply their plough, and be preachers rather than lords; but our blanchers, who will be lords, and no labourers, when they are commanded to go and be resident upon their cures, and to preach in their benefices, they would say, "What! I have set a deputy there! I have a deputy that looketh well to my flock, and the which shall discharge my duty." A deputy, quoth he. I looked for that word all this while. And what a deputy must he be, trow ye? Even one like himself. It must be a canonist, that is to say, one that is brought up in the study of the Pope's laws and decrees. One that will set forth papistry as well as himself will do, and one that will maintain all superstitious idolatry.

And one that will nothing at all, or else very weakly, resist the devil's plough, yea, happy it is if he take not part with the devil; and when he should be an enemy to him, it is well if he take not the devil's part against Christ. But in the meantime the prelates take their pleasures. They are lords, and no labourers; but the devil is diligent at his plough. He is no unpreaching prelate. He is no lordly loiterer from his cure, but a busy ploughman, so that among all the prelates, and among all the pack of them that have cure, the devil shall go for my money. For he still applieth his business. Therefore, ye unpreaching prelates, learn of the devil to be diligent in doing of your office. Learn of the devil. And if you will not learn of God nor good men, for shame learn of the devil. *Ad erubescentiam vestram dico* ["I speak to your shame" (1 Cor. vi. 5)]. I speak it for your shame. If you will not learn of God nor good men to be diligent in your office, learn of the devil. Howbeit there is now very good hope that the king's majesty, being by the help of good governance of his most honourable councillors, he is trained and brought up in learning and knowledge of God's Word, will shortly provide a remedy, and set an order herein; which thing that it may so be, let us pray for him. Pray for him, good people, pray for him; ye have great cause and need to pray for him.

WHAT CARD TO PLAY.

A true and faithful servant, whensoever his master commandeth him to do anything, he maketh no stops nor questions, but goeth forth with a good mind: and it is not unlike he, continuing in such a good mind and will, shall well overcome all dangers and stops, whatsoever betide him in his journey, and bring to pass effectually his master's will and pleasure. On the contrary, a slothful servant, when his master commandeth him to do anything, by-and-by he will ask questions, "Where?" "When?" "Which way?" and so forth; and so he putteth everything in

doubt, that although both his errand and way be never so plain, yet by his untoward and slothful behaviour his master's commandment is either undone quite, or else so done that it shall stand to no good purpose. Go now forth with the good servant, and ask no such questions, and put no doubts. Be not ashamed to do thy Master's and Lord's will and commandment. Go, as I said, unto thy neighbour that is offended by thee, and reconcile him (as is aforesaid), whom thou hast lost by thy unkind words, by thy scorns, mocks, and other disdainous words and behaviours; and be not nice to ask of him the cause why he is displeased with thee: require of him charitably to remit; and cease not till you both depart, one from the other, true brethren in Christ.

Do not, like the sloinful servant, thy master's message with cautels and doubts: come not to thy neighbour, whom thou hast offended and give him a pennyworth of ale, or a banquet, and so make him a fair countenance, thinking that by thy drink or dinner he will show thee like countenance. I grant you may both laugh and make good cheer, and yet there may remain a bag of rusty malice, twenty years old, in thy neighbour's bosom. When he departeth from thee with a good countenance, thou thinkest all is well then. But now, I tell thee, it is worse than it was, for by such cloaked charity, where thou dost offend before Christ but once, thou hast offended twice herein: for now thou goest about to give Christ a mock, if He would take it of thee. Thou thinkest to blind thy master Christ's commandment. Beware, do not so, for at length He will overmatch thee, and take thee tardy whatsoever thou be; and so, as I said, it should be better for thee not to do His message on this fashion, for it will stand thee in no purpose. "What?" some will say, "I am sure he loveth me well enough: he speaketh fair to my face." Yet for all that thou mayest be deceived. It proveth not true love in a man, to speak fair. If he love thee with his mind and heart, he loveth thee with his eyes, with his tongue, with his feet, with his hands and his body; for all these parts of a man's body be obedient to the will and mind. He loveth thee with his eyes, that looketh cheerfully on thee, when thou meetest with him, and is glad to see thee prosper and do well. He loveth thee with his tongue, that speaketh well by thee behind thy back, or giveth thee good counsel. He loveth thee with his feet, that is willing to go to help thee out of trouble and business. He loveth thee with his hands, that will help thee in time of necessity, by giving some alms-deeds, or with any other occupation of the hand. He loveth thee with his body, that will labour with his body, or put his body in danger to do good for thee, or deliver thee from adversity: and so forth, with the other members of his body. And if thy neighbour will do according to these sayings, then thou mayest think that he loveth thee well; and thou, in like wise, oughtest to declare and open thy love unto thy neighbour in like fashion, or else you be bound one to reconcile the other, till this perfect love be engendered amongst you.

It may fortune thou wilt say, "I am content to do the best for my neighbour that I can, saving myself harmless." I promise thee, Christ will not hear this excuse; for He himself suffered harm for our sakes, and for our salvation was put to extreme death. I wis, if it had pleased Him, He might have saved us and never felt pain; but in suffering pains and death He did give us example, and teach us how we should do one for another, as He did for us all; for, as He saith Himself, "he that will be mine, let him deny himself, and follow me, in bearing my cross and suffering my pains." Wherefore we must needs suffer pain with Christ to do our neighbour good, as well with the body and all his members, as with heart and mind.

Now I trust you wot what your card meaneth: let us see how that we can play with the same. Whensoever it shall happen you to go and make your oblation unto God, ask of yourselves this question, "Who art thou?" The answer, as you know, is, "I am a Christian man." Then you must again ask unto yourself, "What Christ requireth of a Christian man?" By-and-by cast down your trump, your heart, and look first of one card, then of another. The first card telleth thee, thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not be angry, thou shalt not be out of patience. This done, thou shalt look if there be any more cards to take up; and if thou look well, thou shalt see another card of the same suit, wherein thou shalt know that thou art bound to reconcile thy neighbour. Then cast thy trump upon them both, and gather them all three together, and do according to the virtue of thy cards; and surely thou shalt not lose. Thou shalt first kill the great Turks, and discomfort and thrust them down. Thou shalt again fetch home Christ's sheep that thou hast lost; whereby thou mayest go both patiently and with a quiet mind unto the church, and make thy oblation unto God; and then, without doubt, He will hear thee.—*Sermons on the Card.*

JOHN KNOX.

1505-1572.

PRAYER.*

***Prayer** springeth out of true faith* (Rom. x.).—How necessary is the right invocation of God's name, otherwise called perfect prayer, becometh no Christian to misknow, seeing it is the very branch which springeth forth of true faith, whereof, if any man be destitute, notwithstanding he be endowed with whatsoever other virtues, yet, in the presence of God, he is reputed for no Christian at all. Therefore, a manifest sign it is, that such as in prayer are always negligent do understand nothing of perfect faith. For if the fire be without heat, or the burning lamp without light, then true faith may be without fervent prayer. But because, in times past was, and yet, alas! with no small number is that reckoned to be prayer which in the sight of God was and is nothing less, I intend shortly to touch the circumstances thereof.

What Prayer is.—Who will pray must know and understand that prayer is an earnest and familiar talking with God, to whom we declare our miseries, whose support and help we implore and desire in our adversities, and whom we laud and praise for our benefits received, so that prayer containeth the exposition of our dolours, the desire of God's defence, and the praising of His magnificent name, as the Psalms of David clearly do teach. That this be most reverently done should provoke in us the consideration in whose presence we stand, to whom we speak, and what we desire; standing in the presence of the Omnipotent Creator of heaven and earth, and of all the contents thereof, to whom assist and serve a thousand thousand of angels, giving obedience to His eternal majesty, and speaking unto Him who knoweth the secrets of our hearts, before whom dissimulation and lies are always odious and hateful, and asking that thing which may be most to His glory and to the comfort of our conscience. But diligently should we attend, that such things as may offend His godly presence to the uttermost of our powers may be removed. And, first, that worldly cares and fleshly cogitations, such as draw us from contemplation of our God, may be expelled from us, that we may freely, without interruption, call upon God. But how difficult and hard is this one thing in prayer to perform, knoweth none better than such as in their prayer are not content to remain within the bonds of their own vanity, but, as it were ravished, do intend to a purity allowed of asking not such things as the foolish reason of man desireth, but which may be pleasant and acceptable in God's presence. Our adversary Satan, at all times compassing us about, is never more ready than when we address and bend ourselves to prayer. Oh, how secretly and subtilely creepeth he into our breasts, and calling us back from God, causeth us to forget what we have to do, so that frequently when we in all reverence should speak to God, we find our hearts talking with the vanities of the world, or with the foolish imaginations of our own conceit.

How the Spirit maketh intercession for us.—Without the Spirit of God supporting our infirmities, mightily making intercession for us with unceasable groans, which cannot be expressed with the tongue, there is no hope of anything we can desire according to God's will. I mean not that the Holy Ghost doth mourn and pray, but that He stirreth up our minds, giving unto us a desire or boldness to pray, and causeth us to mourn when we are extracted or pulled therefrom. Which things to conceive no strength of man sufficeth, neither is able of itself; but hereof it is plain, that such as understand not what they pray, or expound not or declare not the desire of their hearts clearly in God's presence, and in time of prayer to their possibility do not expel vain cogitations from their minds, profit nothing in prayer.

Why we should pray, and also understand what we do pray.—Men will object and say, although we understand not what we pray, yet God understandeth, who knoweth the secrets of our hearts; He knoweth also what we need, although we expose not or declare not our necessities unto Him. Such men verily declare themselves never to have understanding what perfect prayer meant, nor to what end Jesus Christ commandeth us to pray; which is, first, that our hearts may be inflamed with continual fear, honour, and love of God, to whom we run for support and help whenever danger or necessity requireth; that we so learning to notify our

* This sermon was first printed at Rome, July 1554. "In the opening up of his text," says James Melville, speaking of this celebrated preacher during the last days of his life, "he was moderat the space of an half houre; but when he enterit to application, he made me so to *grew* and tremble, that I could not hald a pen to wryt. He was very weik. I saw him everie day of his doctrine go *hulie and fear*, with a furring of marticks about his neck, a staffe in the an hand, and gude godlie Richart Ballenden, his servand, halden up the other *oxter*, from the Abbey to the parish kirk, and by the said Richart and another servand lifted up to the pulpit, whar he behovit to lean at his first entrie; bot ere he hald done with his sermone, he was sa active and vigorous that he was lyk to *ding the pulpit in blads, and flie out of it*."

desires in His presence, He may teach us what is to be desired, and what not; secondly, that we knowing our petitions to be granted by God alone, to Him only must we render and give laud and praise, and that we, ever having His infinite goodness fixed in our minds, may constantly abide to receive that which with fervent prayer we desire.

Why God deferreth our prayer.—For sometime God deferreth or prolongeth to grant our petitions for the exercise and trial of our faith, and not that He sleepeth, or is absent from us at any time, but that with more gladness we might receive that which with long expectation we have abidden, that thereby we, assured of His eternal providence, so far as the infirmity of our weak, and corrupt, and most weak nature will permit, doubt not but His merciful hand shall relieve us in most urgent necessity and extreme tribulation. Therefore, such men as teach us that necessarily it is not required that we understand what we pray, because God knoweth what we need, would also teach us that neither we honour God, nor yet refer or give unto Him thanks for benefits received; for how shall we honour and praise him whose goodness and liberality we know not? And how shall we know and sometime have experience? And how shall we know that we have received, unless we know verily what we have asked?

The second thing to be observed in perfect prayer is, that standing in the presence of God, we be found such as bear reverence to His holy law, earnestly repenting our past iniquity, and intending to lead a new life; for otherwise, in vain are all our prayers, as it is written, "Whoso withdraweth his ear, that he may not hear the law, his prayer shall be abominable" (Prov. xv.). Likewise Isaiah and Jeremiah say thus: "Ye shall multiply your prayers, and I shall not hear, because your hands are full of blood;" that is, of all cruelty and mischievous works. Also the Spirit of God appeareth by the mouth of the blind whom Jesus Christ did illuminate, by these words, "We know that God heareth not sinners" (John ix.); that is, such as glory and do continue in iniquity.

When sinners are not heard of God.—So that of necessity true repentance must needs be had, and go before perfect prayer, or sincere invocation of God's name. And unto these two precedents must be annexed the third, which is the direction of ourselves in God's presence, utterly refusing and casting off our own justice with all cogitations and opinion thereof. And let us not think that we shall be heard for anything proceeding of ourselves. For all such as advance, boast, or depend anything upon their own righteousness, repel and hold from the presence of His mercy with the high, proud Pharisee. And, therefore, the most holy men we find in prayers most dejected and humbled. David saith, "O Lord, our Saviour, help us, be merciful unto our sins for Thy own sake. Remember not our old iniquities, but haste Thou, O Lord, and let Thy mercy prevent us" (Psalm lxxix.). Jeremiah saith, "If our iniquities bear testimony against us, do Thou according to Thy own name." And behold Isaiah: "Thou art angry, O Lord, because we have sinned, and are replenished with all wickedness, and our righteousness is like a defiled cloth. But now, O Lord, Thou art our Father; we are clay; Thou art the workman, and we the workmanship of Thy hands. Be not angry, O Lord; remember not our iniquities for ever" (Isa. lxiv.). And Daniel, greatly commended of God, maketh in his prayer most humble confession, in these words: "We be sinners, and have offended; we have done ungodly, and fallen from Thy commandment: therefore not in our own righteousness make we our prayers before Thee, but Thy most rich and great mercy bring we forth for us. O Lord, hear; O Lord, be merciful, and spare us, O Lord; attend, help, and cease not, my God, even for Thy own name's sake; do it, for Thy city and Thy people are called after Thy own name" (Dan. ix.). Behold, that in these prayers is no mention of their own righteousness, their own satisfaction, or their own merits; but most humble confession, proceeding from a sorrowful and penitent heart, having nothing whereupon it might depend, but the sure mercy of God alone, who had promised to be their God; that is, their help, comfort, defender, and deliverer (as He hath also done to us by Jesus Christ) in time of tribulation. And therefore they despaired not; but after the acknowledging of their sins, called for mercy, and obtained the same. Wherefore, it is plain that such men as in their prayers have respect to any virtue proceeding of themselves, thinking thereby their prayers to be accepted, never prayed aright.

What fasting and alms-deeds are with prayer.—And, albeit, to fervent prayer be joined fasting, watching, and alms-deeds, yet are none of these the cause that God doth accept our prayers. But they are spurs, which suffer us not to vary, but make us more able to continue in prayer, which the mercy of God doth accept.

But here may it be objected that David prayeth, "Keep my life, O Lord, for I am holy: O Lord, save my soul, for I am innocent; and suffer me not to be confounded" (Psalms xxxviii., lxxxvi.). Also Hezekiah: "Remember, Lord, I beseech Thee, that I have walked righteously before Thee, and that I have wrought that which is good in Thy sight" (2 Kings xx.). These words are not spoken of men glorious, neither yet trusting in their own works; but herein they testify themselves to be the sons of God by regeneration, to whom He promiseth always to be merciful, and at all times to hear their prayers.

The cause of their boldness was Jesus Christ.—And so their words spring from a wonted, constant, and fervent faith, surely believing that

as God, of His infinite mercy, had called them to His knowledge, not suffering them to walk after their own natural wickedness, but partly had taught them to conform themselves to His holy law, and that, for the promised Seed's sake, so might He not leave them destitute of comfort, consolation, and defence, in so great and extreme necessity. And so their righteousness allege they not to glory thereof, or to put trust therein, but to strengthen and confirm them in God's promises. And this consolation I would wish to all Christians in their prayers—a testimony of a good conscience to assure them of God's promises; but to obtain what they ask must only depend upon Him, all opinion and thought of our own righteousness laid aside. And, moreover, David, in the words above, compareth himself with King Saul, and with the rest of his enemies who wrongfully did persecute him, desiring of God that they prevail not against him—as he would say, "Unjustly do they persecute me, and therefore, according to my innocency, defend me," for otherwise he confesseth himself most grievously to have offended God, as in the preceding places he clearly testifieth.

Hypocrisy is not allowed with God.—Thirdly, in prayer is to be observed, that what we ask of God, we must earnestly desire the same, acknowledging ourselves to be indigent and void thereof, and that God alone may grant the petition of our hearts when His good will and pleasure is. For nothing is more odious before God than hypocrisy and dissimulation,—that is, when men do ask of God things whereof they have no need, or that they believe to obtain by others than by God alone. As if a man ask of God remission of his sins, thinking, nevertheless, to obtain the same by his own works, or by other men's merits, he doth mock with God, and deceive himself. And, in such cases, do a great number offend, principally the mighty and rich of the earth, who, for a common custom, will pray this part of the Lord's Prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread,"—that is, a moderate and reasonable sustentation; and yet their own hearts will testify that they need not so to pray, seeing they abound in all worldly solace and felicity. I mean not that rich men should not pray this part of prayer, but I would they understood what they ought to pray in it (whereof I intend after to speak), and that they ask nothing whereof they felt not themselves marvellously indigent and needful; for unless we call in verity, He will not grant, and except we speak with our whole heart, we shall not find Him.

The fourth rule necessary to be followed in prayer is, a sure hope to obtain what we ask; for nothing more offendeth God than when we ask doubting whether He will grant our petitions, for in so doing we doubt if God be true, if He be mighty and good. Such, saith James, obtain nothing of God (James i.); and therefore Jesus Christ commandeth that we firmly believe to obtain whatsoever we ask, for all things are possible unto him that believeth. And therefore, in our prayers, desperation is always to be expelled. I mean not that any man, in extremity of trouble, can be without a present dolour, and without a greater fear of trouble to follow. Trouble and fear are the very spurs to prayer; for when man, compassed about with vehement calamities, and vexed with continual solicitude, having, by help of man, no hope of deliverance, with sore oppressed and punished heart, fearing also greater punishment to follow, from the deep pit of tribulation doth call to God for comfort and support, such prayer ascendeth into God's presence, and returneth not in vain.

As David, in the vehement persecution of Saul, hunted and chased from every hole, fearing that one day or other he should fall into the hands of his persecutors, after that he had complained that no place of rest was left to him, vehemently prayed, saying, "O Lord, who art my God, in whom alone I trust, save me from them that persecute me, and deliver me from my enemies. Let not this man (meaning Saul) devour my life, as a lion doth his prey, for of none seek I comfort but of Thee alone" (Psalm vii.). In the midst of these anguishes the goodness of God sustained him, so that the present tribulation was tolerable; and the infallible promises of God so assured him of deliverance, that fear was partly mitigated and gone, as plainly appeareth to such as diligently mark the process of his prayer. For, after long menacing and threatening made to him of his enemy, he concludeth with these words: "The dolour which he intended to me shall fall upon his own pate; and the violence wherewith he would have oppressed me shall cast down his own head: but I will magnify the Lord according to His righteousness, and shall praise the name of the Most High."

God delivereth His chosen from their enemies.—This is not written for David only, but for all such as shall suffer tribulation, to the end of the world. For I, the writer hereof (let this be said to the laud and praise of God alone), in anguish of mind, and vehement tribulation and affliction, called upon the Lord, when not only the ungodly, but even my faithful brethren, yea, and my own-self, that is, all natural understanding, judged my case to be irremediable. And yet, in my greatest calamity, and when my pains were most cruel, His eternal wisdom willed that my hands should write, far contrary to the judgment of carnal reason; which His mercy hath proved true, blessed be His holy name. And therefore dare I be bold in the verity of God's Word to promise that, notwithstanding the vehemency of trouble, the long continuance thereof, the despair of all men, the fearfulness, danger, dolour, and anguish of our own hearts, yet if we call constantly to God, that, beyond expectation of all men, He shall deliver.

Let no man think himself unworthy to call and pray to God, because he hath grievously offended His majesty in times past; but let him bring to God a sorrowful and repenting heart, saying with David, "Heal my soul, O Lord, for I have offended against Thee. Before I was afflicted, I transgressed; but now let me observe Thy commandments" (Psalms vi., cxix.).

To mitigate or ease the sorrows of our wounded conscience, two plaisters hath our most prudent Physician provided, to give us encouragement to pray, notwithstanding the knowledge of offences committed; that is, a Precept and a Promise. The precept or commandment to pray is universal, frequently inculcated and repeated in God's Scriptures: "Ask, and it shall be given unto you" (Matt. vii.). "Call upon me in the day of trouble" (Psalm l.). "Watch and pray, that ye fall not into temptation" (Matt. xxvi.). "I command that ye pray ever, without ceasing" (1 Tim. ii.). "Make deprecations incessable, and give thanks in all things" (1 Thess. v.). Which commandments whoso contemneth or despiseth, doth equally sin with him that doth steal. For as this commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," is a precept negative, so "Thou shalt pray," is a commandment affirmative; and God requireth equal obedience of and to all His commandments. Yet more boldly will I say he who, when necessity constraineth, desireth not support and help of God, doth provoke His wrath no less than do such as make false gods, or openly deny God.

He that prayeth not in trouble, denieth God.—For like as it is to know no physician or medicine, or, in knowing them, refuse to use and receive the same, so, not to call upon God in thy tribulation, is like as if thou didst not know God, or else utterly deny Him.

Not to pray is a sin most odious.—Oh! why cease we then to call instantly upon His mercy, having His commandment so to do? Above all our iniquities, we work manifest contempt and despising of Him, when by negligence we delay to call for His gracious support. Whoso calleth on God obeyeth His will, and findeth therein no small consolation, knowing nothing is more acceptable to His majesty than humble obedience.

To this commandment He addeth His most undoubted promise in many places: "Ask, and ye shall receive; seek, and ye shall find" (Matt. vii.). And by the prophet Jeremiah God saith, "Ye shall call upon me, and I shall hear you; ye shall seek, and shall find me" (Jer. xxix.). And by Isaiah He saith, "May the father forget his natural son, or the mother the child of her womb? And although they do, yet shall I not forget such as call upon me." And hereto correspond and agree the words of Jesus Christ, saying, "If ye, being wicked, can give good gifts to your children, much more my heavenly Father shall give the Holy Ghost to them that ask Him" (Matt. vii.). And that we should not think God to be absent, or not to hear us, Moses occurreth, saying, "There is no nation that have their gods so adherent or nigh unto them as our God, who is present at all our prayers" (Deut. iv.). Also the Psalmist, "Near is the Lord to all that call upon Him in verity." And Christ saith, "Wheresoever two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."

Readiness of God to hear sinners.—That we may not think that God will not hear us, Isaiah saith, "Before ye cry I shall hear, and while they yet speak I shall answer." And also, "If at even come sorrow or calamity, before the morning spring, I shall reduce [restore], and bring gladness." And these most comfortable words doth the Lord not speak to carnal Israel only, but to all men sore oppressed, abiding God's deliverance: "For a moment and a little season have I turned my face from thee, but in everlasting mercy shall I comfort thee."

The hope to obtain our petitions should depend upon the promises of God.—Oh! hard are the hearts which so manifold most sweet and sure promises do not mollify, whereupon should depend the hope to obtain our petitions. The indignity or unworthiness of ourselves is not to be regarded; for albeit to the chosen who are departed, in holiness and purity of life we be far inferiors; yet in that part we are equal, in that we have the same commandment to pray, and the same promise to be heard. For His gracious majesty esteemeth not the prayer, neither granteth the petition, for any dignity or worthiness of the person that prayeth, but for His promise' sake only. And therefore, saith David, "Thou hast promised unto Thy servant, O Lord, that Thou wilt build a house for him; wherefore Thy servant hath found in his heart to pray in Thy sight. Now, even so, O Lord, Thou art God, and Thy words are true: Thou hast spoken these good things unto Thy servant. Begin, therefore, to do according to Thy promise: multiply, O Lord, the household of Thy servant." Behold, David altogether dependeth upon God's promise; as also did Jacob, who, after he had confessed himself unworthy of all the benefits received, yet durst he ask greater benefits in time to come, and that because God hath promised. In like manner, let us be encouraged to ask whatsoever the goodness of God hath freely promised. What we should ask principally, we shall hereafter declare.

Of necessity we must have a mediator.—The fifth observation which godly prayer requireth is the perfect knowledge of the advocate, intercessor, and mediator; for, seeing no man is of himself worthy to compear or appear in God's presence, by reason that in all men continually resteth sin, which, by itself, doth offend the majesty of God, raising also debate, strife, hatred, and division, betwixt His inviolable justice and us, for the which, unless satisfaction

be made by another than by ourselves, so little hope resteth that anything from Him we can attain, that no surety may we have with Him at all. To exeme us from this horrible confusion, our most merciful Father, knowing that our frail minds should hereby have been continually dejected, hath given unto us His only beloved Son, to be unto us righteousness, wisdom, sanctification, and holiness. If in Him we faithfully believe, we are so clad that we may with boldness compear and appear before the throne of God's mercy, doubting nothing, but that whatsoever we ask through our Mediator, that same we shall obtain most assuredly. Here, is most diligently to be observed, that without our Mediator, Fore-speaker, and Peacemaker, we enter not into prayer; for the incallings of such as pray without Jesus Christ are not only vain, but also they are odious and abominable before God. Which thing to us in the Levitical priesthood most evidently was prefigured and declared: for as within the *sanctum sanctorum*, that is, the most holy place, entered no man but the high priest alone, and as all sacrifices offered by any other than by priests only, provoked the wrath of God upon the sacrifice maker; so, whoever doth intend to enter into God's presence, or to make prayers without Jesus Christ, shall find nothing but fearful judgment and horrible damnation. Wherefore it is plain, that Turks and Jews, notwithstanding that they do apparently most fervently pray unto God who created heaven and earth, who guideth and ruleth the same, who defendeth the good and punisheth the evil, yet never are their prayers pleasant unto God; neither honour they His holy majesty in anything, because they acknowledge not Jesus Christ. For he who honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father. For as the law is a statute that we shall call upon God, and as the promise is made that He shall hear us, so are we commanded only to call through Jesus Christ, by whom alone our petitions we obtain; for in Him alone are all the promises of God confirmed and complete. Whereof, without all controversy, it is plain that such as have called, or call presently unto God by any other means than by Jesus Christ alone, do nothing regard God's will, but obstinately prevaricate, and do against His commandments; and therefore obtain they not their petitions, neither yet have entrance to His mercy; "for no man cometh to the Father," saith Jesus Christ, "but by me." He is the right way: who declineth from Him erreth, and goeth wrong. He is our leader, whom, unless we follow, we shall walk in darkness; and He alone is our captain, without whom, neither praise nor victory ever shall we obtain.

Against such as depend upon the intercession of saints, no otherwise will I contend, but shortly touch the properties of a perfect mediator. First, the words of Paul are most sure, that a mediator is not the mediator of one; that is, wheresoever is required a mediator, there are also two parties; to wit, one party offending, and the other party which is offended; which parties, by themselves may in no ways be reconciled. Secondly, the mediator who taketh upon him the reconciling of these two parties must be such a one as having trust and favour of both parties, yet in some things must differ from both, and must be clean and innocent also of the crime committed against the party offended. Let this be more plain by this subsequent declaration:

Angels may not be mediators.—The eternal God, standing upon the one part, and all natural men descending of Adam upon the other part; the infinite justice of God is so offended with the transgression of all men, that in no wise can amity be made, except such a one be found as fully may make satisfaction for man's offences. Among the sons of men none was found able; for they were all found criminal in the fault of one; and God, infinite in justice, must abhor the society and sacrifice of sinners. And as to the angels, what might prevail their substitution for man? who, albeit they would have interposed themselves as mediators, yet they had not the infinite righteousness.

Jesus Christ, God and man, is Mediator.—Who, then, shall here be found the peacemaker? Surely the infinite goodness and mercy of God might not suffer the perpetual loss and repudiation of His creatures; and therefore His eternal wisdom provided such a mediator, having wherewith to satisfy the justice of God—differing also from the Godhead—His only Son, clad in the nature of manhood, who interposed Himself a mediator; not as man only; for the pure humanity of Christ of itself might neither make intercession nor satisfaction for us; but God and man. In that He is God He might complete the will of the Father; and in that He is man, pure and clean, without spot or sin, He might offer sacrifice for the purgation of our sins, and satisfaction of God's justice. For unless saints have these two, Godhead equal with the Father, and humanity without sin, the office of mediators saints may not usurp.

But here will be objected, "Who knoweth not Jesus Christ to be the only mediator of our redemption? but that impedeth or hindereth nothing saints and holy men to be mediators, and to make intercession for us." As though that Jesus Christ had been but one hour our mediator, and after, had resigned the office to His servants!

Who maketh other mediators than Jesus Christ, taketh honour from Him.—Do not such men gentilly* entreat Jesus Christ, detracting from Him such a portion of His honour? Otherwise speak the Scriptures of God, testifying Him to have been made man, and to have proved our infirmities, to have suffered death willingly, to

* Handsomely.

have overcome the same, and all to this end, that He might be our perpetual high sovereign Priest, into whose place or dignity none other might enter (Heb. vi., vii., ix., x.). As John saith, "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, even Jesus Christ the righteous" (1 John ii.). Mark well these words. John saith, "We have presently a sufficient advocate; whom Paul affirmeth to sit at the right hand of God the Father" (Rom. viii.), and to be the only Mediator between God and man; for He alone, saith Ambrose, is our mouth, by whom we speak to God, He is our eyes, by whom we see God, and also our right hand, by whom we offer anything unto the Father, who, unless He make intercession, neither we, neither any of the saints, may have any society or fellowship with God. What creature may say to God the Father, "Let mankind be received into Thy favour; for the pain of his transgression, that have I sustained in my own body; for his cause was I encompassed with all infirmities, and so became the most contemned and despised of all men, and yet in my mouth was found no guile nor deceit, but always obedient to Thy will, suffering most grievous death for mankind. And therefore, behold not the sinner, but me, who, by my infinite righteousness, have perfectly satisfied for his offences?" May any other, Jesus Christ except, in these words make intercession for sinners? If they may not, then are they neither mediators, nor yet intercessors. "For albeit," saith Augustine, "Christians do commend one another unto God in their prayers, yet make they not intercession, neither dare they usurp the office of a mediator; no, not Paul, albeit under the Head he was a principal member, because he commendeth himself to the prayers of faithful men." But if any do object, such is not the condition of the saints departed, who now have put off mortality, and bear no longer the fragility of the flesh; although I grant this to be most true, yet are they all compelled to cast their crowns before Him who sitteth on the throne, acknowledging themselves to have been delivered from great affliction, to have been purged by the blood of the Lamb; and therefore none of them do attempt to be a mediator, seeing they neither have being nor righteousness of themselves. But in so great light of the Gospel which now is beginning (praise be to the Omnipotent!), it is not necessary [upon such matter long to remain.

Some say, we will use but one mediator, Jesus Christ, to God the Father; but we must have saints, and chiefly the Virgin, the mother of Jesus Christ, to pray for us unto Him.

Against such as would have mediators to Jesus Christ.—Alas! whosoever is so minded, showeth himself plainly to know nothing of Jesus Christ rightly. Is He who descended from heaven, and vouchsafed to be conversant with sinners, commanding all sore vexed and sick to come unto Him (Matt. xi.), who, hanging upon the cross, prayed first for His enemies, become now so untractable that He will not hear us without a person to be a mean? O Lord! open the eyes of such, that they may clearly perceive Thy infinite kindness, gentleness, and love towards mankind.

Above all precedents is to be observed, that what we ask of God ought to be profitable to ourselves and to others, and hurtful or dangerous to no man. Secondly, we must consider whether our petitions extend to spiritual or corporal things.

Spiritual things, such as are deliverance from impiety, remission of sins, the gift of the Holy Ghost, and of life everlasting, we should desire absolutely, without any condition, by Jesus Christ, in whom alone all these are promised. And in asking hereof, we should not pray thus, "O Father! forgive our sins if Thou wilt," for His will He hath expressed, saying, "As I live, I desire not the death of a sinner, but rather that he convert, and live," which immutable and solemn oath who calleth in doubt, maketh God a liar, and, as far as in him lieth, would spoil God of His Godhead. For He cannot be God except He be eternal and infallible verity. And John saith, "This is the testimony which God hath testified of His Son, that who believeth in the Son hath eternal life" (1 John v.), to the verity whereof we should steadfastly cleave, although worldly dolour apprehend us; as David, exiled from his kingdom, and deprived of all his glory, secluded not himself from God, but steadfastly believed reconciliation by the promise made, notwithstanding that all creatures on earth had refused, rejected, and rebelled against Him. Happy is the man whom Thou shalt inspire, O Lord!

In asking corporal things, first let us inquire if we be at peace with God in our consciences, by Jesus Christ, firmly believing our sins to be remitted in His blood. Secondly, let us inquire of our own hearts if we know temporal riches or substance not to come to man by accident, fortune, or chance, neither yet by the industry and diligence of man's labour, but to be the liberal gift of God only, whereof we ought to laud and praise His goodness, wisdom, and providence alone.

What should be prayed for.—And if this we do truly acknowledge and confess, let us boldly ask of Him whatsoever is necessary for us; as sustentation of the body, health thereof, defence from misery, deliverance from trouble, tranquillity and peace to our commonwealth, prosperous success in our vocations, labours, and affairs, whatsoever they be; which God willeth we ask all of Him, to certify us that all things stand in His government and disposal, and also, by asking and receiving these corporal commodities, we may have taste of His sweetness, and be inflamed with His love, that thereby our faith of reconciliation and remission of our sins may be exercised and take increase.

But, in asking such temporal things, we must

observe, first, that if God deferreth or prolongeth to grant our petitions, even so long that He doth apparently reject us, yet let us not cease to call, prescribing Him neither time, neither manner of deliverance, as it is written, "If He prolong time, abide patiently upon Him," and also, "Let not the faithful be too hasty; for God sometimes deferreth, and will not hastily grant, for the probation of our continuance," as the words of Jesus Christ testify; and also that we may receive with greater gladness that which with ardent desire we long have looked for, as Hannah, Sarah, and Elizabeth, after great ignominy of their barrenness and sterility, received fruit of their bosoms with joy.

Secondly, because we know the kirk at all times to be under the cross. In asking temporal commodities, and especially deliverance from trouble, let us offer to God obedience; if it shall please His goodness we be longer exercised, that we may patiently abide it. As David, desirous to be restored to his kingdom, what time he was exiled by his own son, offereth unto God obedience, saying, "If I have found favour in the presence of the Lord, He shall bring me home again. But if He shall say, Thou pleasest me no longer to bear authority, I am obedient; let Him do what seemeth good to Him" (2 Sam. xv.). And the three children unto Nebuchadnezzar did say, "We know that our God whom we worship may deliver us; but if it shall not please Him so to do, let it be known to thee, O king, that thy gods we will not worship" (Dan. iii.).

Better it is to obey God than man.—Here the [children] gave a true confession of their perfect faith, knowing nothing to be impossible to the omnipotence of God; affirming also themselves to stand in His mercy, for otherwise the nature of man could not willingly give itself to so horrible a torment. But they offer unto God most humble obedience, to be delivered at His good pleasure and will, as we should do in all afflictions; for we know not what to ask or desire as we ought—that is, the frail flesh, oppressed with fear and pain, desireth deliverance, ever abhorring and drawing back from obedience-giving. (O Christian brother, I write by experience!) But the Spirit of God calleth back the mind to obedience, that albeit it desires and abides for deliverance, yet should it not repine against the good will of God, but incessantly to ask that it may abide with patience. How hard this battle is no man knoweth, but he who in himself hath suffered trial.

The petition of the spirit.—It is to be noted that God sometimes doth grant the petition of the spirit, while He yet deferreth the desire of the flesh. As who doubteth but God did mitigate the heaviness of Joseph, although He sent not hasty deliverance in his long imprisonment; and that as He gave him favour in the sight of his jailer, so inwardly also He gave him consolation in spirit? (Gen. xxxix.) And moreover, God sometimes granteth the petition of the spirit, while He utterly repelleth the desire of the flesh. For the petition of the spirit always is that we may attain to the true felicity, whereunto we must needs enter by tribulation, and the final death, both of which the nature of man doth ever abhor. And therefore the flesh under the cross, and at the sight of death, calleth and thirsteth for hasty deliverance.

The flesh striveth against the spirit.—But God, who alone knoweth what is expedient for us, sometimes prolongeth the deliverance of His chosen, and sometimes permitteth them to drink, before the maturity of age, the bitter cup of corporal death, that thereby they may receive medicine and cure from all infirmity. For who doubteth but that John the Baptist desired to have seen more the days of Jesus Christ, and to have been longer with Him in conversation? or that Stephen would not have laboured more days in preaching Christ's Gospel, whom, nevertheless, He suffered hastily to taste of this general sentence? And albeit we see therefore no apparent help to ourselves, nor yet to others afflicted, let us not cease to call, thinking our prayers to be vain; for whatsoever come of our bodies, God shall give unspeakable comfort to the spirit, and turn all to our commodities [advantages], beyond our own expectation. The cause I am so long tedious in this matter is, that I know how hard the battle is between the spirit and the flesh, under the heavy cross of affliction, where no worldly defence but present death does appear.

Impediments come of the weakness of the flesh.—I know the grudging and murmuring complaints of the flesh; I know the anger, wrath, and indignation which it conceiveth against God, calling all His promises in doubt, and being ready every hour utterly to fall from God. Against which remains only faith, provoking us to call earnestly, and pray for assistance of God's Spirit, wherein, if we continue, our most desperate calamities He shall turn to gladness, and to a prosperous end.

To Thee, O Lord, alone be praise! for with experience I write this and speak.

Where, and for whom, and at what time, we ought to pray, is not to be passed over with silence.

Private prayer, such as men secretly offer unto God by themselves, requires no special place, although Jesus Christ commandeth, when we pray, to enter into our chamber, and to close the door, and so to pray secretly unto our Father (Matt. vi.). Whereby He wills that we should choose for our prayers such places as might offer least occasion to call us back from prayer, and also that we should expel forth of our minds in time of our prayer all vain cogitations; for otherwise, Jesus Christ himself doth observe no special place o prayer, for we find Him sometimes praying in Mount Olivet, sometimes in the desert, sometimes in the temple, and in the garden. Peter

desireth to pray upon the top of the house (Acts x.). Paul prayed in prison, and was heard of God, who also commandeth men to pray in all places, lifting up unto God pure and clean hands, as we find that the prophets and most holy men did, wheresoever danger or necessity required.

Appointed places to pray in may not be neglected.—But public and common prayers should be used in the place appointed for the assembly of the congregation, whence whosoever negligently withdraweth himself is in nowise excusable. I mean not that to be absent from that place is sin, because that place is more holy than another; for the whole earth created by God is equally holy. But the promise made, that "wheresoever two or three are gathered together in my name, there shall I be in the midst of them," condemneth all such as despise the congregation gathered in His name. But mark well this word "gathered." I mean not to hear piping, singing, or playing; nor to patter upon beads or books whereof they have no understanding; nor to commit idolatry, honouring that for God which indeed is no god; for with such will I neither join myself in common prayer, nor in receiving external sacraments. For in so doing, I should affirm their superstition and abominable idolatry, which I, by God's grace, never will do, neither counsel others to do, to the end.

What it is to be gathered in the name of Christ.—This congregation which I mean should be gathered in the name of Jesus Christ; that is, to laud and magnify God the Father, for the infinite benefits they have received by His only Son, our Lord. In this congregation should be distributed the mystical and Last Supper of Jesus Christ, without superstition or any more ceremonies than He himself used, and His apostles after Him, in distribution thereof. In this congregation should inquisition be made of the poor among them, and support provided till the time of their next convention; and it should be distributed amongst them. Also in this congregation should be made common prayers, such as all men hearing might understand, that the hearts of all subscribing to the voice of one, might with unfeigned and fervent mind say, Amen. Whosoever withdraw themselves from such a congregation (but alas! where shall it be found?) do declare themselves to be no members of Christ's body.

For whom and at what time we should pray.—Now there remaineth for whom and at what time we shall pray. For all men, and at all times, doth Paul command that we shall pray (1 Tim. ii.), and principally for such as are of the household of faith as suffer persecution; and for commonwealths tyrannously oppressed, incessantly should we call, that God of His mercy and power will withstand the violence of such tyrants.

God's sentence may be changed.—And when we see the plagues of God, as hunger, pestilence, or war, coming or appearing to reign, then should we with lamentable voices and repenting hearts call unto God, that it would please His infinite mercy to withdraw His hand. Which thing, if we do unfeignedly, He will without doubt revoke His wrath, and, in the midst of His fury, think upon mercy, as we are taught in the Scripture, by His infallible and eternal verity. As in Exodus God saith, "I shall destroy this nation from the face of the earth." And when Moses addresseth himself to pray for them the Lord proceedeth, saying, "Suffer me that I may utterly destroy them." And then Moses falleth down upon his face, and forty days continueth in prayer for the safety of the people, for whom, at the last, he obtained forgiveness. David, in the vehement plague, lamentably called unto God (2 Sam. xxiv.); and the King of Nineveh saith, "Who can tell? God may turn and repent, and cease from His fierce wrath, that we perish not" (Jonah iii.). Which examples and scriptures are not written in vain, but to certify us that God of His own native goodness will mitigate His plagues, by our prayers offered by Jesus Christ, although He hath threatened to punish, or is presently punishing: which He testifies by His own words, saying, "If I have prophesied against any nation or people, that they shall be destroyed, if they repent of their iniquity, it shall repent me of the evil which I have spoken against them" (Jer. xviii.). This I write, lamenting the great coldness of men who, under such long scourges of God, are nothing kindled to prayer by repentance, but carelessly sleep in a wicked life, even as though their continuing wars, urgent famine, daily plagues of pestilence, and other contagious, insolent, and strange maladies, were not the present signs of God's wrath provoked by our iniquities.

A plague threatened to England.—O England, let thy intestine battle and domestic murder provoke thee to purity of life, according to the word which openly hath been proclaimed in thee, otherwise, the cup of the Lord's wrath thou shalt drink. The multitude shall not escape, but shall drink the dregs, and have the cup broken upon their heads; for judgment beginneth in the house of the Lord, and commonly the least offender is first punished, to provoke the more wicked to repentance. But, O Lord, infinite in mercy, if Thou shalt punish, make not consummation; but cut away the proud and luxuriant branches which bear not fruit, and preserve the commonwealths of such as give succour and harbour to Thy contemned messengers, who long have suffered exile in the desert. And let Thy kingdom shortly come, that sin may be ended, death devoured, Thy enemies confounded; that we Thy people, by Thy majesty delivered, may obtain everlasting joy and felicity through Jesus Christ our Savour, to whom be all honour and praise for ever. Amen. Hasten, Lord, and tarry not.

Hereafter followeth a confession by John Knox, Minister of Christ's most sacred Evangel, upon the death of that most virtuous and most famous king, Edward VI., King of England, France, and Ireland; in which confession, the said John doth accuse no less his own offences, than the offences of others, to be the cause of the away-taking of that most godly prince, now reigning with Christ, while we abide plagues for our unthankfulness.

Omnipotent and everlasting God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who by Thy eternal providence disposest kingdoms as seemeth best to Thy wisdom: we acknowledge and confess Thy judgments to be righteous, in that Thou hast taken from us, for our ingratitude, and for abusing Thy most holy Word, our native king and earthly comforter. Justly mayest Thou pour forth upon us the uttermost of Thy plagues, for that we have not known the day and time of our merciful visitation. We have contemned Thy Word, and despised Thy mercies: we have transgressed Thy laws, for deceitfully have we wrought every man with our neighbour; oppression and violence we have not abhorred, charity hath not appeared among us, as our profession requireth. We have little regarded the voices of Thy prophets; Thy threatenings we have esteemed vanity and wind. So that in us, as of ourselves, rests nothing worthy of Thy mercies, for all are found fruitless, even the princes with the prophets as withered trees, apt and meet to be burned in the fire of Thy eternal displeasure.

But, O Lord, behold Thy own mercy and kindness, that Thou mayest purge and remove the most filthy burden of our most horrible offences. Let Thy love overcome the severity of Thy judgments, even as it did in giving to the world Thy only Son, Jesus, when all mankind was lost, and no obedience was left in Adam nor in his seed. Regenerate our hearts, O Lord, by the strength of the Holy Ghost: convert Thou us, and we shall be converted: work Thou in us unfeigned repentance, and move Thou our hearts to obey Thy holy laws.

Behold our troubles and apparent destruction, and stay the sword of Thy vengeance before it devour us. Place above us, O Lord, for Thy great mercies' sake, such a head, with such rulers and magistrates as fear Thy name, and will the glory of Christ Jesus to spread. Take not from us the light of Thy Evangel, and suffer no papistry to prevail in this realm. Illuminate the heart of our sovereign lady, Queen Mary, with pregnant gifts of Thy Holy Ghost, and inflame the hearts of her council with Thy true fear and love. Repress Thou the pride of those that would rebel, and remove from all hearts the contempt of Thy Word. Let not our enemies rejoice at our destruction, but look Thou to the honour of Thy own name, O Lord, and let Thy Gospel be preached with boldness in this realm. If Thy justice must punish, then punish our bodies with the rod of Thy mercy. But, O Lord, let us never revolt, nor turn back to idolatry again. Mitigate the hearts of those that persecute us, and let us not faint under the cross of our Saviour; but assist us with the Holy Ghost, even to the end.

JOHN JEWELL, D.D.,

BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

1522-1571.

CHALLENGE SERMON AT ST PAUL'S CROSS, ON THE HOLY COMMUNION AND THE MASS.*

St Paul, after he was once appointed out by God to be His chosen vessel, to carry His name among all people, having occasion to make his abode for a long time in the city of Corinth, began there to instruct the people, to draw them from the follies and errors that they and their fathers had long lived in aforetime, and to lead them to the Gospel of Christ, which then God of His mercy had newly showed unto the world. And therewithal he delivered unto them the sacrament, or holy mystery of Christ's Last Supper, to be practised and continued amongst them as a most certain pledge and testimony of the same.

But after that through the wickedness of the Jews he was driven to depart thence, and to sail into Syria, the false prophets, men full of pride and vain-glory, taking occasion at his absence, sought means to discredit whatsoever he had taught or done: and caused the people not only to mislike the Gospel of Christ, that they had received at St Paul's hand, but also to missense the sacraments. For as touching the Gospel, they were fallen from it into sundry great and horrible heresies concerning the resurrection, and other special points of Christ's religion. And as touching the sacraments, whereas St

---

* 1 Cor. xi. 23. First preached at St Paul's Cross, November 26, 1559, afterwards expanded and preached at Court, March 17, 1560, and also on March 31st. It produced an immense sensation.

Paul had appointed them the holy mysteries of the breaking of Christ's body, and shedding of His blood, that they should all eat and drink together with fear and reverence in remembrance of His death and passion, and so cleave together in brotherly charity, as being all the members of one body, they forgetting the very use and institution thereof, made small account of Christ's death, took each man to himself severally his own supper, despised their poor brethren, rent and divided the Church of God, and so made the holy sacrament of love and charity to serve them as instrument of discord and dissension.

Therefore saith St Paul unto them, "Shall I praise you for thus doing? in this thing surely I may not praise you; for I see your congregations and common meetings are not to the better, but to the worse."

For a redress hereof he calleth them back to the first original, and to the institution of Christ, from whence they were fallen. "For I," saith he, "being amongst you, delivered you none other thing than that I had received of the Lord. That thing He thought meetest for you; and therefore with the same ought you also to be contented." . . .

Thus St Paul, that the Corinthians might the better understand that they had irreverently missensed the Lord's Supper, and be the more willing to redress the same, laid Christ's first institution before their eyes as a true pattern, whereby the sooner they might redress it. "Look," saith he, "what thing I received of the Lord, the same thing I delivered over faithfully unto you. I gave you not any fancy or device of mine own, but that thing only that Christ had before delivered me. This rule is infallible. Hereby your doings may best be tried." This I judge to be the very true meaning of these words of St Paul. Now, forasmuch as in this last age of the world the same holy sacrament, or mystery of Christ's Last Supper, had been likewise stained with divers foul abuses; and specially for that, notwithstanding it hath pleased Almighty God of His great mercy in these our days to remove away all such deformities, and to restore again the same holy mysteries to the first original, yet there be divers that wilfully remain in ignorance, and not only be unthankful unto Almighty God for His great benefits, but also take pleasure in the errors wherein they have of long time been trained; and that not only the poor and ignorant, but also the rich, and such as should be learned and know God; I have thought it good therefore at this time to stand the longer upon the same words of St Paul, that we may the more clearly see the first institution of the holy sacrament, and how far in these latter days we have strayed from it. It was to be hoped, forasmuch as the glorious light of the Gospel of Christ is now so mightily and so far spread abroad, that no man would lightly miss his way (as afore in the time of darkness) and perish wilfully. . . .

Yet there are some that whisper in corners, that the mass is a blessed and a catholic thing, and that the holy communion, which now God of His great mercy hath restored to us, is wicked and schismatical; and therefore they murmur against it, therefore they refrain it, and will not come to it.

O merciful God, who would think there could be so much wilfulness in the heart of man? O Gregory! O Augustine! O Hierom! O Chrysostom! O Leo! O Dionyse! O Anacletus! O Sixtus! O Paul! O Christ! if we be deceived herein, ye are they that have deceived us: you have taught us these schisms and divisions; ye have taught us these heresies.

Thus ye ordered the holy communion in your time; the same we received at your hand, and have faithfully delivered it unto the people. And that ye may the more marvel at the wilfulness of such men, they stand this day against so many old fathers, so many doctors, so many examples of the primitive Church, so manifest and so plain words of the Holy Scriptures; and yet have they herein not one father, not one doctor, not one allowed example of the primitive Church, to make for them. And when I say no one, I speak not this in vehemency of spirit, or heat of talk, but even as before God, by the way of simplicity and truth, lest any of you should haply be deceived, and think there is more weight in the other side, than in conclusion there shall be found. And therefore once again I say, Of all the words of the Holy Scriptures, of all the examples of the primitive Church, of all the old fathers, of all the ancient doctors, in these causes they have not one.

Here the matter itself that I have now in hand putteth me in remembrance of certain things that I uttered unto you, to the same purpose, at my last being in this place. I remember I laid out then here before you a number of things, that are now in controversy, whereunto our adversaries will not yield. And I said, perhaps boldly, as it might then seem to some men, but as I myself, and the learned of our adversaries themselves, do well know, sincerely and truly, that none of all them that this day stand against us are able, or shall ever be able, to prove against us any one of all those points, either by the Scriptures, or by example of the primitive Church, or by the old doctors, or by the ancient general councils.

Since that time it hath been reported in places, that I spake then more than I was able to justify and make good. Howbeit, these reports were only made in corners, and therefore ought the less to trouble me. But if my sayings had been so weak, and might so easily have been reproved, I marvel that the parties never yet came to the light, to take the advantage. For my promise was, and that openly here before you all, that if any man were able to prove the contrary, I

would yield and subscribe to him, and he should depart with the victory.

Loath I am to trouble you with rehearsal of such things as I have spoken before; and yet, because the case so requireth, I shall desire you that have already heard me to bear the more with me in this behalf. Better it were to trouble your ears with twice hearing of one thing, than to betray the truth of God. The words that I then spake, as near as I can call them to mind, were these: "If any learned man of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old catholic doctor or father, or out of any old general council, or out of the Holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved, that there was any private mass in the whole world at that time, for the space of six hundred years after Christ; or that there was then any communion ministered unto the people under one kind; or that the people had their common prayers then in a strange tongue, that they understood not; or that the Bishop of Rome was then called a universal bishop, or the head of the universal Church; or that the people was then taught to believe that Christ's body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally in the sacrament; or that His body is or may be in a thousand places, or more, at one time; or that the priest did then hold up the sacrament over his head; or that the people did then fall down and worship it with godly honour; or that the sacrament was then, or ought now to be, hanged up under a canopy; or that in the sacrament, after the words of consecration, there remaineth only the accidents and shows, without the substance of bread and wine; or that the priest then divided the sacrament in three parts, and afterward received himself all alone; or that whosoever had said the sacrament is a figure, a pledge, a token, or a remembrance of Christ's body, had therefore been judged for a heretic; or that it was lawful then to have thirty, twenty, fifteen, ten, or five masses said in one church in one day; or that images were then set up in the churches, to the intent the people might worship them; or that the lay people was then forbidden to read the Word of God in their own tongue: If any man alive were able to prove any of these articles, by any one clear or plain clause or sentence, either of the Scriptures, or of the old doctors, or of any old general council, or by any example of the primitive Church, I promised then that I would give over and subscribe unto him."

Wherefore, beside all that I have said already, I will say further, and yet nothing so much as might be said. If any one of all our adversaries be able clearly and plainly to prove, by such authority of the Scriptures, the old doctors, and councils, as I said before, that it was then lawful for the priest to pronounce the words of consecration closely and in silence to himself, or that the priest had then authority to offer up Christ unto His Father, or to communicate and receive the sacrament for another as they do, or to apply the virtue of Christ's death and passion to any man by the mean of the mass; or that it was then thought a sound doctrine to teach the people that the mass, *ex opere operato*, that is, even for that it is said and done, is able to remove any part of our sin; or that then any Christian man called the sacrament his Lord and God; or that the people was then taught to believe that the body of Christ remaineth in the sacrament as long as the accidents of the bread remain there without corruption; or that a mouse, or any other worm or beast, may eat the body of Christ (for so some of our adversaries have said and taught); or that when Christ said, *Hoc est corpus meum*, this word *hoc* pointeth not the bread, but *individium vagum*, as some of them say; or that the accidents, or forms, or shows of bread and wine be the sacraments of Christ's body and blood, and not rather the very bread and wine itself; or that the sacrament is a sign or token of the body of Christ that lieth hidden underneath it; or that ignorance is the mother and cause of the devotion and obedience—these be the highest mysteries and greatest keys of their religion, and without them their doctrine can never be maintained and stand upright. . . .

Thus the people of God is deceived and mocked, and instead of precious stones, driven to take counterfeits. For, I assure you, brethren, in the time of Peter and James, neither was there any man that ever heard the name of mass (for *missa* was never named until four hundred years after Christ, and yet then was it no private mass neither, but a communion), nor yet were the pieces and parts of the mass, as we in our time have seen them, set together. And what mass could that be, that as yet had neither her own name nor her parts? But forasmuch as they affirm so constantly that St James said mass at Jerusalem, and whatsoever it were that he said, will needs have it called by the name of a mass; let us compare their mass and St James's mass both together. St James said his mass in the common tongue, as the people might understand him; they say their mass in a strange Latin tongue, that the people should not know what they mean. St James spake out the words of consecration distinctly and plainly; they in their mass suppress the same words, and keep them close. St James in his mass ministered the communion unto the people; they in their mass receive themselves all alone. St James in his mass ministered the sacrament unto the people under both kinds; they in their mass minister the sacrament unto the people in one kind only. St James in his mass preached and set forth the death of Christ; they in their mass have only a number of dumb gestures and ceremonies, which they themselves understand not, and make

no manner mention of Christ's death. St James's mass was full of knowledge; their mass is full of ignorance. St James's mass was full of consolation; their mass is full of superstition. When St James said mass, the people resorted to receive the sacrament; when they say mass, the people resorteth to look upon only and to behold the sacrament. And to conclude, St James in his mass had Christ's institution; they, in their mass, have well near nothing else but man's invention.

Such difference ye may see between St James's mass and theirs. Oh that St Paul were now alive and saw the behaviour and order of the priests at their mass! Think ye that he would take it and account it for the Lord's Supper? When he had espied but one fault in the holy communion amongst the Corinthians, straightway he rebuked them, and called them back to Christ's institution. "This," said he, "I received of the Lord, and the same I gave over unto you."

But if he saw the disorder that we have seen, would he not be moved as much against us now as he was sometime against the Corinthians? Would he not pull us back to the institution of Christ as he did them? Would he not say unto us, "Did I ever teach you to minister the communion to the people in one kind? Did I ever teach you to say mass, or to receive the sacrament for the people? Did I ever teach you the idle follies of your canon? Did I ever teach you to offer up the Son of God unto His Father? Did I ever teach you any other propitiatory sacrifice for sin than that Christ once offered upon the cross? Did I ever teach you to minister the Lord's Supper wherein the people should nothing else but look upon and behold your doings, without any kind of knowledge or comfort? Did I ever teach you to lift the sacrament over your head? Did I ever teach the people to fall down thereunto, and to worship they know not what? Be these the things that I delivered you? Be these the things that I received of the Lord?" This would St Paul say unto us if he were now alive. Thus would he reprove us, and call us to the standard and original of the first appointing of the holy sacrament.

Our own inventions and phantasies wherewith we had filled the mass were so many and so gross, that they quite covered and shadowed the death of Christ, and the holy mysteries of our salvation. Therefore we could not truly say, "These things Paul delivered unto us, or these things Paul received of the Lord."

Wherefore, good people, and dearly beloved brethren, forasmuch as we see there have been great and evident abuses and errors in the mass, so plain and so manifest, that no man that hath reason, and will consider them, can deny it; let us follow the counsel of St Paul, let us return to the ordinance of Christ, unto the true standard that cannot fail us.

As it is not in the power of man to appoint sacraments, so is it not in the power of man to alter or change sacraments. God will not be worshipped after our phantasies, and therefore so oftentimes He chargeth us in the Scriptures, *Non facietis quod bonum videtur in oculis vestris*—"Ye shall not do that thing that seemeth good to you in your own sight;" ye shall not turn neither to the left hand nor to the right, but what thing soever I bid you do, that only shall ye do. Your thoughts be not my thoughts, neither be your ways my ways; for as far as heaven is from the earth, or the east from the west, so far off be your thoughts from my thoughts, and your ways from my ways, saith the Lord. It is a dangerous thing for a mortal man to control or find fault with the wisdom of the immortal God.

Tertullian, an old father of the Church, showeth us the wilfulness of man's heart, after it hath once enterprised to presume a little against God's truth and ordinance: *Praetur scripturas faciunt, ut post audacius contra scripturas faciant.* "First," saith he, "they attempt somewhat beside the Scriptures, to the intent that afterward they may gather courage and boldness to do contrary to the Scriptures." At the end they proceed as far as the Scribes and Pharisees that, for maintenance of their own traditions, despised and brake the commandments of God. For redress therein there is no better way than to follow St Paul's counsel here, and to have recourse to God's Holy Word.

St Ambrose saith—*Interrogemus Petrum: interrogemus Paulum, si verum volumus invenire*—"If we will find out the truth, and be put out of doubt," saith St Ambrose, "let us hearken what Peter and Paul will say unto us."

St Cyprian saith—*Hinc schismata oriuntur, quia caput non quæritur, et ad fontem non reditur, et cœlestis magistri præcepta non servantur*—"Hereof," saith St Cyprian, "arise schisms and divisions, for that we seek not to the head, nor have recourse to the spring, nor keep the commandments of the heavenly Master."

Tertullian saith—*Hæc ratio contra omnem hæresim valet, hoc verum est, quod primum fuit*—"This reason," saith he, "is able to confound all manner of heresies. That thing is true that was first appointed."

Oh that our adversaries, and all they that stand in defence of the mass this day, would content themselves to be judged by this rule! Oh that, in all the controversies that lie between us and them, they would remit the judgment unto God's Word! So should we soon agree and join together; so should we deliver nothing unto the people but that we have received at God's hand.

And if there be any here that have had, or yet have any good opinion of the mass, I beseech you for God's sake, even as ye tender your own salvation, suffer not yourselves wilfully to be led away, run not blindly to your own confusion. Think with yourselves, it was not for nought

that so many of your brethren rather suffered themselves to die, and to abide all manner of extremity and cruelty, than they would be partakers of that thing that you reckon to be so holy. Let their death, let their ashes, let their blood, that was so abundantly shed before your eyes, somewhat prevail with you, and move you. Be not ruled by your wilful affections. Ye have a good zeal and mind towards God; have it according unto the knowledge of God. The Jews had a zeal of God, and yet they crucified the Son of God. Search the Scriptures; there shall ye find everlasting life. There shall ye learn to judge yourselves, and your own doings, that ye be not judged of the Lord. If ever it happen you to be present again at the mass, think but thus with yourselves—What make I here? What profit have I of my doings? I hear nothing; I understand nothing; I am taught nothing; I receive nothing. Christ bade me take; I take nothing. Christ bade me eat; I eat nothing. Christ bade me drink; I drink nothing. Is this the institution of Christ? Is this the Lord's Supper? Is this the right use of the holy mysteries? Is this it that Paul delivered unto me? Is this it that Paul received of the Lord? Let us say but thus unto ourselves, and no doubt God of His mercy will open our hearts; we shall see our errors, and content ourselves to be ordered by the wisdom of God; to do that God will have us to do; to believe that God will have us to believe; to worship that God will have us worship. So shall we have comfort of the holy mysteries; so shall we receive the fruits of Christ's death; so shall we be partakers of Christ's body and blood; so shall Christ truly dwell in us, and we in Him; so shall all error be taken from us; so shall we join all together in God's truth; so shall we all be able with one heart and one spirit to know and to glorify the only, the true, and the living God, and His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, to whom both, with the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory for ever and ever, Amen.

RICHARD HOOKER.

1554-1600.

THE CERTAINTY AND PERPETUITY OF FAITH IN THE ELECT.*

We have seen in the opening of this clause which concerneth the weakness of the prophet's faith, first, what things they are whereunto the faith of sound believers doth assent; secondly, wherefore all men assent not thereunto; and thirdly, why they that do, do it many times with small assurance. Now because nothing can be so truly spoken but through misunderstanding it may be depraved; therefore, to prevent, if it be possible, all misconstruction in this cause, where a small error cannot rise but with great danger, it is perhaps needful, ere we come to the fourth point, that something be added to that which hath been already spoken concerning the third.

That mere natural men do neither know nor acknowledge the things of God, we do not marvel, because they are spiritually to be discerned; but they in whose hearts the light of grace doth shine, they that are taught of God, why are they so weak in faith? why is their assenting to the law so scrupulous—so much mingled with fear and wavering? It seemeth strange that ever they should imagine the law to fail. It cannot seem strange if we weigh the reason. If the things which we believe be considered in themselves, it may truly be said that faith is more certain than any science. That which we know, either by sense, or by infallible demonstration, is not so certain as the principles, articles, and conclusions of Christian faith. Concerning which we must note, that there is a Certainty of Evidence and a Certainty of Adherence. Certainty of Evidence we call that, when the mind doth assent unto this or that, not because it is true in itself, but because the truth is clear, because it is manifest unto us. Of things in themselves most certain, except they be also most evident, our persuasion is not so assured as it is of things more evident, although in themselves they be less certain. It is as sure, if not surer, that there be spirits, as that there be men; but we be more assured of these than of them, because these are more evident. The truth of some things is so evident that no man which heareth them can doubt of them: as when we hear that "a part of anything is less than the whole," the mind is constrained to say, This is true. If it were so in matters of faith, then, as all men have equal certainty of this, so no believer should be more scrupulous and doubtful than another. But we find the contrary. The angels and spirits of the righteous in heaven have certainty most evident of things spiritual; but this they have by the light of glory. That which we see by the light of grace, though it be indeed more certain, yet is it not to us so evidently certain, as that which sense or the light of nature will not suffer a man.

* ["Therefore the law is slacked, and judgment doth never go forth" (Habak. i. 4)]. Whether the prophet Habakkuk, by admitting this cogitation into his mind, "The law doth fail," did thereby show himself an unbeliever.

to doubt of. Proofs are vain and frivolous, except they be more certain than is the thing proved: and do we not see how the Spirit everywhere in the Scripture proveth matters of faith, laboureth to confirm us in the things which we believe, by things whereof we have sensible knowledge? I conclude, therefore, that we have less certainty of evidence concerning things believed, than concerning sensible or naturally perceived. Of these who doth doubt at any time? Of them, at some time, who doubteth not? I will not here allege the sundry confessions of the perfectest that have lived upon earth concerning their great imperfections this way: which if I did, I should dwell too long upon a matter sufficiently known by every faithful man that doth know himself.

The other, which we call the Certainty of Adherence, is when the heart doth cleave and stick unto that which it doth believe. This certainty is greater in us than the other. The reason is this: the faith of a Christian doth apprehend the words of the law, the promises of God, not only as true, but also as good; and therefore, even then when the evidence which he hath of the truth is so small that it grieveth him to feel his weakness in assenting thereto, yet is there in him such a sure adherence unto that which he doth but faintly and fearfully believe, that his spirit having once truly tasted the heavenly sweetness thereof, all the world is not able quite and clean to remove him from it; but he striveth with himself to hope against all reason of believing, being settled with Job upon this unmovable resolution, "Though God kill me, I will not give over trusting in Him" (Job xiii. 15). For why? this lesson remaineth for ever imprinted in him, "It is good for me to cleave unto God" (Psalm lxxiii. 28).

Now the minds of all men being so darkened as they are with the foggy damp of original corruption, it cannot be that any man's heart living should be either so enlightened in the knowledge, or so established in the love of that wherein his salvation standeth, as to be perfect, neither doubting nor shrinking at all. If any such were, what doth let why that man should not be justified by his own inherent righteousness? For righteousness inherent, being perfect, will justify. And perfect faith is a part of perfect righteousness inherent; yea, a principal part, the root and the mother of all the rest: so that if the fruit of every tree be such as the root is, faith being perfect, as it is if it be not at all mingled with distrust and fear, what is there to exclude other Christian virtues from the like perfections? And then what need we the righteousness of Christ? His garment is superfluous: we may be honourably clothed with our own robes if it be thus. But let them beware who challenge to themselves a strength which they have not, lest they lose the comfortable support of that weakness which indeed they have.

Some show, although no soundness of ground, there is, which may be alleged for the defence of this supposed perfection in certainty touching matters of our faith; as first, that Abraham did believe and doubted not; secondly, that the Spirit which God hath given us to no other end, but only to assure us that we are the sons of God, to embolden us to call upon Him as our Father, to open our eyes, and to make the truth of things believed evident unto our minds, is much mightier in operation than the common light of nature, whereby we discern sensible things: wherefore we must needs be more sure of that we believe, than of that we see; we must needs be more certain of the mercies of God in Christ Jesus, than we are of the light of the sun when it shineth upon our faces.

To that of Abraham, "He did not doubt" [(Rom. iv. 20) *οὐ διεκρίθη τῃ ἀπιστίᾳ*]; I answer, this negation doth not exclude all fear, all doubting, but only that which cannot stand with true faith. It freeth Abraham from doubting through infidelity, not from doubting through infirmity; from the doubting of unbelievers, not of weak believers; from such a doubting as that whereof the prince of Samaria is attainted, who hearing the promise of sudden plenty in the midst of extreme dearth, answered, "Though the Lord would make windows in heaven, were it possible so to come to pass?" (2 Kings vii. 2). But that Abraham was not void of all doubtings, what need we any other proof than the plain evidence of his own words (Gen. xvii. 17)?

The reason which is taken from the power of the Spirit were effectual, if God did work like a natural agent, as the fire doth inflame, and the sun enlighten, according to the uttermost ability which they have to bring forth their effects. But the incomprehensible wisdom of God doth limit the effects of His power to such a measure as seemeth best unto Himself. Wherefore He worketh that certainty in all, which sufficeth abundantly to their salvation in the life to come; but in none so great as attaineth in this life unto perfection. Even so, O Lord, it hath pleased Thee; even so it is best and fittest for us, that feeling still our own infirmities, we may no longer breathe than pray, *Adjuva, Domine* ["Help, Lord, our incredulity" (Mark ix. 24)]. Of the third question, this I hope will suffice, being added unto that which hath been thereof already spoken. The fourth question resteth, and so an end of this point.

That which cometh last of all in this first branch to be considered concerning the weakness of the prophet's faith, "Whether he did by this very thought, *The law doth fail*, quench the Spirit, fall from faith, and show himself an unbeliever or no?" The question is of moment; the repose and tranquillity of infinite souls doth depend upon it. The prophet's case is the case of many; which way soever we cast for him, the same way it passeth for all others. If in him

this cogitation did extinguish grace, why the like thoughts in us should not take the like effects, there is no cause. Forasmuch therefore as the matter is weighty, dear, and precious, which we have in hand, it behoveth us with so much the greater chariness to wade through it, taking special heed both what we build, and whereon we build, that if our building be pearl, our foundation be not stubble; if the doctrine we teach be full of comfort and consolation, the ground whereupon we gather it be sure: otherwise we shall not save but deceive both ourselves and others. In this we know we are not deceived, neither can we deceive you, when we teach that the faith whereby ye are sanctified cannot fail; it did not in the prophet, it shall not in you. If it be so, let the difference be shown between the condition of unbelievers and his, in this or in the like imbecility and weakness. There was in Habakkuk that which St John doth call "the seed of God" (1 John ii. 9), meaning thereby the First Grace which God poureth into the hearts of them that are incorporated into Christ; which having received, if because it is an adversary to sin, we do therefore think we sin not both otherwise, and also by distrustful and doubtful apprehending of that which we ought steadfastly to believe, surely we do but deceive ourselves. Yet they which are of God do not sin either in this, or in anything, any such sin as doth quite extinguish grace, clean cut them off from Christ Jesus; because the "seed of God" abideth in them, and doth shield them from receiving any irremediable wound. Their faith, when it is at the strongest, is but weak; yet even then when it is at the weakest, so strong, that utterly it never faileth, it never perisheth altogether, no, not in them who think it extinguished in themselves. There are for whose sakes I dare not deal slightly in this cause, sparing that labour which must be bestowed to make it plain. Men in like agonies unto this of the prophet Habakkuk's are through the extremity of grief many times in judgment so confounded, that they find not themselves in themselves. For that which dwelleth in their hearts they seek, they make diligent search and inquiry. It abideth, it worketh in them, yet still they ask where; still they lament as for a thing which is past finding: they mourn as Rachel, and refuse to be comforted, as if that were not which indeed is, and as if that which is not were; as if they did not believe when they do, and as if they did despair when they do not. Which in some I grant is but a melancholy passion, proceeding only from that dejection of mind, the cause whereof is the body, and by bodily means can be taken away. But where there is no such bodily cause, the mind is not lightly in this mood, but by some of these three occasions: one, that judging by comparison either by other men, or with themselves at some other time more strong, they think imperfection to be a plain deprivation, weakness to be utter want of faith.

Another cause is, they often mistake one thing for another. St Paul wishing well to the Church of Rome prayeth for them after this sort: "The God of hope fill you with all joy of believing" (Rom. xv. 15). Hence an error groweth, when men in heaviness of spirit suppose they lack faith, because they find not the sugared joy and delight which indeed doth accompany faith, but so as a separable accident, as a thing that may be removed from it; yea, there is a cause why it should be removed. The light would never be so acceptable, were it not for that usual intercourse of darkness. Too much honey doth turn to gall; and too much joy, even spiritually, would make us wantons. Happier a great deal is that man's case, whose soul by inward desolation is humbled, than he whose heart is through abundance of spiritual delight lifted up and exalted above measure. Better it is sometimes to go down into the pit with him, who, beholding darkness, and bewailing the loss of inward joy and consolation, crieth from the bottom of the lowest hell, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" (Psalm xxii. 1), than continually to walk arm-in-arm with angels, to sit as it were in Abraham's bosom, and to have no thought, no cogitation, but "I thank my God it is not with me as it is with other men" (Luke xviii. 11). No, God will have them that shall walk in light to feel now and then what it is to sit in the shadow of death. A grieved spirit, therefore, is no argument of a faithless mind.

A third occasion of men's misjudging themselves, as if they were faithless when they are not, is they fasten their cogitations upon the distrustful suggestions of the flesh, whereof finding great abundance in themselves, they gather thereby, "Surely unbelief hath full dominion, it hath taken plenary possession of me; if I were faithful, it could not be thus: not marking the motions of the Spirit and of faith, because they lie buried and overwhelmed with the contrary: when notwithstanding, as the blessed apostle doth acknowledge, that 'the Spirit groaneth' (Rom. viii. 26, 27), and that God heareth when we do not; so there is no doubt, but that our faith may have and hath her privy operations secret to us, in whom, yet known to Him by whom they are."

Tell this to a man that hath a mind deceived by too hard an opinion of himself, and it doth but augment his grief: he hath his answer ready, "Will you make me think otherwise than I find, than I feel in myself? I have thoroughly considered and exquisitely sifted all the corners of my heart, and I see what there is; never seek to persuade me against my knowledge; I do not, I know I do not believe."

Well, to favour them a little in their weakness; let that be granted which they do imagine; be it

that they are faithless and without belief. But are they not grieved for their unbelief? They are. Do they not wish it might, and also strive that it may, be otherwise? We know they do. Whence cometh this, but from a secret love and liking which they have of those things that are believed? No man can love things which in his own opinion are not. And if they think those things to be, which they show that they love when they desire to believe them; then must it needs be, that by desiring to believe they prove themselves true believers. For without faith, no man thinketh that things believed are. Which argument all the subtlety of infernal powers will never be able to dissolve.

The faith, therefore, of true believers, though it have many and grievous downfalls, yet doth it still continue invincible; it conquereth and recovereth itself in the end. The dangerous conflicts whereunto it is subject are not able to prevail against it. The prophet Habakkuk remained faithful in weakness, though weak in faith.

It is true, such is our weak and wavering nature, we have no sooner received grace, but we are ready to fall from it: we have no sooner given our assent to the law, that it cannot fail, but the next conceit which we are ready to embrace is, that it may, and that it doth fail. Though we find in ourselves a most willing heart to cleave unseparably unto God, even so far as to think unfeignedly with Peter, "Lord, I am ready to go with Thee into prison and to death" (Luke xxii. 33); yet how soon and how easily, upon how small occasions are we changed, if we be but a while let alone and left unto ourselves? The Galatians to-day, for their sakes which teach them the truth of Christ, content, if need were, to pluck out their own eyes (Gal. iv. 5), and the next day ready to pluck out theirs which taught them. The love of the Angel of the Church of Ephesus, how greatly inflamed, and how quickly slacked (Apoc. ii. 2, 4).

The higher we flow, the nearer we are unto an ebb, if men be respected as mere men, according to the wonted course of their alterable inclination, without the heavenly support of the Spirit.

Again, the desire of our ghostly enemy is so uncredible, and his means so forcible to overthrow our faith, that whom the blessed apostle knew betrothed and made hand-fast unto Christ, to them he could not write but with great trembling: "I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy, for I have prepared you to one husband to present you a pure virgin unto Christ: but I fear, lest as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity which is in Christ" (2 Cor. xi. 2, 3). The simplicity of faith which is in Christ taketh the naked promise of God, His bare word, and on that it resteth. This simplicity the serpent laboureth continually to pervert, corrupting the mind with many imaginations of repugnancy and contrariety between the promise of God and those things which sense or experience or some other fore-conceived persuasion hath imprinted.

The word of the promise of God unto His people is, "I will not leave thee nor forsake thee" (Josh. i. 5; Heb. xiii. 5): upon this the simplicity of faith resteth, and it is not afraid of famine. But mark how the subtlety of Satan did corrupt the minds of that rebellious generation, whose spirits were not faithful unto God. They beheld the desolate state of the desert in which they were, and by the wisdom of their sense concluded the promise of God to be but folly: "Can God prepare a table in the wilderness?" (Psalm lxxviii. 19.)

The word of the promise to Sarah was, "Thou shalt bear a son." Faith is simple, and doubteth not of it; but Satan, to corrupt the simplicity of faith, entangleth the mind of the woman with an argument drawn from common experience to the contrary: "A woman that is old! Sarah now to be acquainted again with forgotten passions of youth!" (Gen. xviii. 12.)

The word of the promise of God by Moses and the prophets made the Saviour of the world so apparent unto Philip, that his simplicity could conceive no other Messias than Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph. But to stay Nathanael, lest being invited to come and see, he should also believe, and so be saved, the subtlety of Satan casteth a mist before his eyes, putteth in his head against this the common-conceived persuasion of all men concerning Nazareth: "Is it possible that a good thing should come from thence?" (John i. 46.)

This stratagem he doth use with so great dexterity, the minds of all men are so strangely bewitched with it, that it bereaveth them for the time of all perceivance of that which should relieve them and be their comfort; yea, it taketh all remembrance from them, even of things wherewith they are most familiarly acquainted. The people of Israel could not be ignorant that He who led them through the sea was able to feed them in the desert; but this was obliterated and put out by the sense of their present want. Feeling the hand of God against them in their food, they remember not His hand in the day that He delivered them from the hand of the oppressor. Sarah was not then to learn that "with God all things were possible" (Matt. xix. 26). Had Nathanael never noted how "God doth choose the base things of this world to disgrace them that are most honourably esteemed?" (1 Cor. i. 27, 28.)

The prophet Habakkuk knew that the promises of grace, protection, and favour, which God in the law doth make unto His people, do not grant them any such immunity as can free and exempt them from all chastisements: he knew that as God said, "I will continue my mercy for ever towards them," so He likewise

said, "Their transgressions I will punish with a rod" (Psalm lxxxix. 28, 32): he knew that it cannot stand with any reason we should set the measure of our own punishments, and prescribe unto God how great or how long our sufferings shall be: he knew that we were blind, and altogether ignorant what is best for us; that we sue for many things very unwisely against ourselves, thinking we ask fish when indeed we crave a serpent: he knew that when the thing we ask is good, and yet God seemeth slow to grant it, He doth not deny but defer our petitions, to the end we might learn to desire great things greatly: all this he knew. But, beholding the land which God had severed for His own people, and seeing it abandoned unto heathen nations; viewing how reproachfully they did tread it down, and wholly make havoc of it at their pleasure; beholding the Lord's own royal seat made a heap of stones, His temple defiled, the carcases of His servants cast out for the fowls of the air to devour, and the flesh of His meek ones for the beasts of the field to feed upon; being conscious to himself how long and how earnestly he had cried, "Succour us, O God of our welfare, for the glory of Thine own name" (Psalm lxxix. 9); and feeling that their sore was still increased: the conceit of repugnancy between this which was object to his eyes, and that which faith upon promise of the law did look for, made so deep an impression and so strong, that he disputeth not the matter; but without any further inquiry or search inferreth, as we see, "The law doth fail."

Of us, who is here which cannot very soberly advise his brother? Sir, you must learn to strengthen your faith by that experience which heretofore you have had of God's great goodness towards you: *Per ea quæ agnoscas præstita, discas sperare promissa*—"By those things which you have known performed, learn to hope for those things which are promised." Do you acknowledge to have received much? Let that make you certain to receive more: *Habenti dabitur*—"To him that hath more shall be given." When you doubt what you shall have, search what you have had at God's hands. Make this reckoning, that the benefits which He hath bestowed are bills obligatory, and sufficient sureties that He will bestow further. His present mercy is still a warrant of His future love, because, "whom He loveth, He loveth unto the end" (John xiii. 1). Is it not thus?

Yet if we could reckon up as many evident, clear, undoubted signs of God's reconciled love towards us as there are years, yea days, yea hours, past over our heads; all these set together have not such force to confirm our faith as the loss, and sometimes the only fear of losing a little transitory goods, credit, honour, or favour of men,—a small calamity, a matter of nothing,—to breed a conceit, and such a conceit as is not easily again removed, that we are clean crossed out of God's book, that He regards us not, that He looketh upon others, but passeth by us like a stranger to whom we are not known. Then we think, looking upon others, and comparing them with ourselves, "Their tables are furnished day by day; earth and ashes are our bread: they sing to the lute, and they see their children dance before them; our hearts are heavy in our bodies as lead, our sighs beat as thick as a swift pulse, our tears do wash the beds wherein we lie: the sun shineth fair upon their foreheads; we are hanged up like bottles in the smoke, cast into corners like the sherds of a broken pot: tell not us of the promises of God's favour, tell such as do reap the fruit of them; they belong not to us, they are made to others." The Lord be merciful to our weakness, but thus it is.

Well, let the frailty of our nature, the subtlety of Satan, the force of our deceivable imaginations be, as we cannot deny but they are, things that threaten every moment the utter subversion of our faith; faith notwithstanding is not hazarded by these things. That which one sometimes told the senators of Rome (Sallust. Jugurth. c. 14), *Ego sic existimabam, P. C. uti patrem sæpe meum prædicantem audiveram, qui vestram amicitiam diligenter colerent, eos multum laborem suscipere, cæterum ex omnibus maxime tutos esse*—"As I have often heard my father acknowledge, so I myself did ever think, that the friends and favourers of this state charged themselves with great labour, but no man's condition so safe as theirs;" the same we may say a great deal more justly in this case: our fathers and prophets, our Lord and Master, hath full often spoken, by long experience we have found it true, as many as have entered their names in the mystical Book of Life, *Eos maximum laborem suscipere*, they have taken upon them a labour-some, a toilsome, a painful profession, *sed omnium maxime tutos esse*, but no man's security like to theirs. "Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired to winnow thee as wheat" (Luke xxii. 31, 32); here is our toil: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; this is our safety. No man's condition so sure as ours: the prayer of Christ is more than sufficient both to strengthen us, be we never so weak, and to overthrow all adversary power, be it never so strong and potent. His prayer must not exclude our labour: their thoughts are vain who think that their watching can preserve the city which God himself is not willing to keep: and are not theirs as vain who think that God will keep the city for which they themselves are not careful to watch? The husbandman may not therefore burn his plough, nor the merchant forsake his trade, because God hath promised, "I will not forsake thee." And do the promises of God concerning our stability, think you, make it a matter indifferent for us to use or not to use the means whereby to attend or not to attend to reading? to pray or not to pray that we "fall not into

temptations?" Surely if we look to stand in the faith of the sons of God, we must hourly, continually, be providing and setting ourselves to strive. It was not the meaning of our Lord and Saviour in saying, "Father, keep them in Thy name" (John xvii. 11), that we should be careless to keep ourselves. To our own safety, our own sedulity is required. And then blessed for ever and ever be that mother's child whose faith hath made him the child of God. The earth may shake, the pillars of the world may tremble under us, the countenance of the heaven may be appalled, the sun may lose his light, the moon her beauty, the stars their glory; but concerning the man that trusteth in God, if the fire have proclaimed itself unable as much as to singe a hair of his head, if lions, beasts ravenous by nature, and keen with hunger, being set to devour, have, as it were, religiously adored the very flesh of the faithful man; what is there in the world that shall change his heart, overthrow his faith, alter his affection towards God, or the affection of God to him? If I be of this note, who shall make a separation between me and my God? "Shall tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?" (Rom. viii. 35, 38, 39.) No; "I am persuaded that neither tribulation, nor anguish, nor persecution, nor famine, nor nakedness, nor peril, nor sword, nor death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature," shall ever prevail so far over me. "I know in whom I have believed;" I am not ignorant whose precious blood hath been shed for me; I have a Shepherd full of kindness, full of care, and full of power: unto Him I commit myself; His own finger hath engraven this sentence in the tables of my heart, "Satan hath desired to winnow thee as wheat, but I have prayed that thy faith fail not:" therefore the assurance of my hope I will labour to keep as a jewel unto the end; and by labour, through the gracious mediation of His prayer, I shall keep it.

JOHN DONNE*

1573-1631.

HEAVEN.

In this house of His Father's, thus by Him made ours, there are mansions; in which word, the consolation is not placed (I do not say that there is not truth in it), but the consolation is not placed in this, that some of these mansions are below, some above stairs, some better seated, better lighted, better vaulted, better fretted, better furnished than others; but only in this, that they are mansions, which word, in the original, and Latin, and our language, signifies a remaining, and denotes the perpetuity, the everlastingness of that state. A state but of one day, because no night shall overtake or determine it, but such a day as is not of a thousand years, which is the longest measure in the Scriptures, but of a thousand millions of millions of generations: *Qui nec præceditur hesterno, nec excluditur crastino* (Augustine), a day that hath no *pridie*, nor *postridie*, yesterday doth not usher it in, nor to-morrow shall not drive it out. Methuselah, with all his hundreds of years, was but a mushroom of a night's growth to this day; and all the four monarchies, with all their thousands of years, and all the powerful kings, and all the beautiful queens of this world, were but as a bed of flowers, some gathered at six, some at seven, some at eight, all in one morning, in respect of this day. In all the two thousand years of nature, before the law given by Moses, and the two thousand years of law, before the Gospel given by Christ, and the two thousand of grace, which are running now (of which last hour we have heard three-quarters strike, more than fifteen hundred of this last two thousand spent), in all this six thousand, and in all those which God may be pleased to add, *in domo patris*, in this house of His Father's, there was never heard quarter clock to strike, never seen minute glass to turn. No time less than itself would serve to express this time, which is intended in this word mansions; which is also exalted with another beam, that they are *Multa*—"In my Father's house there are many mansions."

In this circumstance, an essential, a substantial circumstance, we would consider the joy of our society and conversation in heaven, since society and conversation is one great element and ingredient into the joy which we have in this world. We shall have an association with

---

* "A preacher in earnest, weeping sometimes for his auditory, sometimes with them; always preaching to himself, like an angel from a cloud, but in none; carrying some, as St Paul was, to heaven in holy raptures, and enticing others by a sacred art and courtship to amend their lives; here picturing a vice so as to make it ugly to those that practised it, and a virtue so as to make it beloved even by those that loved it not; and all this with a most particular grace, and an inexpressible addition of comeliness."—*Isaak Walton.*

Christ himself; for where He is, it is His promise that we also shall be. We shall have an association with the angels, and such a one as we shall be such as they. We shall have an association with the saints, and not only so, to be such as they, but to be they: and with all "who come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. viii. 11). Where we shall be so far from being enemies to one another, as that we shall not be strangers to one another: and so far from envying one another, as that all that every one hath shall be every other's possession: where all souls shall be so entirely knit together as if all were but one soul, and God so entirely knit to every soul as if there were as many Gods as souls.

Be comforted, then, says Christ to them, for this, which is a house, and not a ship, not subject to storms by the way, nor wrecks in the end; my Father's house, not a stranger's, in whom I had no interest, a house of mansions, a dwelling, not a sojourning, and of many mansions, not an abridgment, a model of a house, not a monastery of many cells, but an extension of many houses, into the city of the living God, this house shall be yours, though I depart from you. Christ is nearer us when we behold Him with the eyes of faith in heaven than when we seek Him in a picce of bread, or in a sacramental box here. Drive Him not away from thee by wrangling and disputing how He is present with thee; unnecessary doubts of His presence may induce fearful assurances of His absence: the best determination of the real presence is to be sure that thou be really present with Him, by an ascending faith: make sure thine own real presence, and doubt not of His: thou art not the further from Him by His being gone thither before thee.

No, nor though Peter be gone thither before thee neither, which was the other point, in which the apostles needed consolation; they were troubled that Christ would go, and none of them, and troubled that Peter might go, and none but he. What men soever God takes into heaven before thee, though thy father that should give thee thy edueation, though thy pastor that should give thee thy instruction, though these men may be such in the State, and such in the Church, as thou mayest think the Church and State cannot subsist without them, discourage not thyself, neither admit a jealousy or suspicion of the providence and good purpose of God; for, as God hath His pannier full of manna and of quails, and can pour out to-morrow, though He have poured them out plentifully upon His friends before; so God hath His quiver full of arrows, and can shoot as powerfully as heretofore upon His enemies. I forbid thee not St Paul's wish, *cupio dissolvi*, to desire to be dissolved, therefore, that thou mayest be with Christ; I forbid thee not David's sigh, *Hei mihi*—"Woe is me that I must dwell so long with them that love not peace!" I only enjoin thee thy Saviour's *Veruntamen*—"Yet not mine, but Thy will, O Father, be done;" that all thy wishes may have relation to His purposes, and all thy prayers may be inanimated with that—Lord, manifest Thy will unto me, and conform my will unto Thine. So shalt thou not be affrighted, as though God aimed at thee, when He shoots about the mark, and thou seest a thousand fall at thy right hand, and ten thousand at thy left; nor discouraged as though God had left out thee, when thou seest Him take others into garrison, and leave thee in the field, assume others to triumph, and leave thee in the battle still. For as Christ Jesus would have come down from heaven to have died for thee, though there had been no soul to have been saved but thine; so is He gone up to heaven to prepare a place for thee, though all the souls in this world were to be saved as well as thine. Trouble not thyself with dignity, and priority, and precedency in heaven, for consolation and devotion consist not in that, and thou wilt be the less troubled with dignity, and priority, and precedency in this world, for rest and quietness consist not in that.*

SEEING GOD.

No man ever saw God and lived; and yet, I shall not live till I see God; and when I have seen Him I shall never die. What have I ever seen in this world, that hath been truly the same thing that it seemed to me? I have seen marble buildings, and a chip, a crust, a plaster, a face of marble hath pilled off, and I see brick bowels within. I have seen beauty, and a strong breath from another tells me that that complexion is from without, not from a sound constitution within. I have seen the state of princes, and all that is but ceremony; and I would be loath to put a master of ceremonies to define ceremony, and tell me what it is, and to include so various a thing as ceremony, in so constant a thing as a definition. I see a great officer, and I see a man of mine own profession, of great revenues, and I see not the interest of the money that was paid for it; I see not the pensions nor the annuities that are charged upon that office or that church. As he that fears God fears nothing else, so he that sees God sees everything else. When we shall see God, *sicuti est*, as He is (1 John iii. 2), we shall see all things *secuti sunt*, as they are; for that is their essence, as they conduce to His glory. We shall be no more deluded with outward appearances; for when this sight, which we intend here, comes, there will be no delusory thing to be seen. All that we have made as though we saw, in this world, will be vanished,

* Works, vol. iii., pp. 325-328.

and I shall see nothing but God, and what is in Him, and Him I shall see, *in carne*—"in the flesh," which is another degree of exaltation in mine exinanition.

I shall see Him, *in carne sua*—"in His flesh," and this was one branch in St Augustine's great wish, that he might have seen Rome in her state, that he might have heard St Paul preach, that he might have seen Christ in the flesh. St Augustine hath seen Christ in the flesh one thousand two hundred years, in Christ's glorified flesh; but it is with the eyes of his understanding, and in his soul. Our flesh, even in the resurrection, cannot be a spectacle, a perspective glass to our soul. We shall see the humanity of Christ with our bodily eyes, then glorified; but that flesh, though glorified, cannot make us see God better nor clearer than the soul alone hath done, all the time from our death to our resurrection. But, as an indulgent father, or as a tender mother, when they go to see the king in any solemnity, or any other thing of observation and curiosity, delights to carry their child, which is flesh of their flesh, and bone of their bone, with them, and though the child cannot comprehend it as well as they, they are as glad that the child sees it as that they see it themselves; such a gladness shall my soul have that this flesh (which she will no longer call her prison nor her tempter, but her friend, her companion, her wife), that this flesh, that is I, in the reunion and redintegration of both parts, shall see God; for then one principal clause in her rejoicing and acclamation shall be, that this flesh is her flesh; *In carne mea*—"In my flesh I shall see God."

It was the flesh of every wanton object here, that would allure it in the petulancy of mine eye. It was the flesh of every satirical libeller, and defamer, and calumniator of other men, that would call upon it, and tickle mine ear with aspersions and slanders of persons in authority. And in the grave, it is the flesh of the worm; the possession it transferred to him. But in heaven it is *caro mea*—"my flesh," my soul's flesh, my Saviour's flesh. As my meat is assimilated to my flesh, and made one flesh with it—as my soul is assimilated to my God, and made partaker of the divine nature (2 Peter i. 4), and *idem spiritus*, the same spirit with it (1 Cor. vi. 17), so there my flesh shall be assimilated to the flesh of my Saviour, and made the same flesh with Him too. *Verbum caro factum ut caro resurgeret* (Athanasius); therefore the Word was made flesh, therefore God was made man, that that union might exalt the flesh of man to the right hand of God. That is spoken of the flesh of Christ; and then to facilitate the passage for us, *Reformat ad immortalitatem suam participes sui* (Cyril); those who are worthy receivers of His flesh here, are the same flesh with Him; and God shall quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you (Rom. viii. 11). But this is not in consummation, in full accomplishment, till this resurrection, when it shall be *caro mea*, my flesh, so as that nothing can draw it from the allegiance of my God; and *caro mea*—"my flesh," so as that nothing can divest me of it. Here a bullet will ask a man, where's your arm? and a wolf will ask a woman, where's your breast? A sentence in the Star Chamber will ask him, where's your ear! and a month's close prison will ask him, where's your flesh? A fever will ask him, where's your red? and a morphew will ask him, where's your white? But when after all this, when "After my skin worms shall destroy my body, I shall see God," I shall see Him in my flesh, which shall be mine as inseparably (in the effect, though not in the manner), as the hypostatical union of God and man in Christ, makes our nature and the Godhead one person in Him. My flesh shall no more be none of mine, than Christ shall not be man, as well as God.

SIN.*

Sin is so far from being nothing, as that there is nothing else but sin in us; sin hath not only a place, but a palace, a throne, not only a being, but a dominion, even in our best actions: and if every action of ours must needs be denominated from the degrees of good or of bad that are in it, howsoever there may be some tincture of some moral goodness, in some actions, every action will prove a sin, that is, vitiated and depraved with more ill, than rectified with good conditions. And then every sin will prove *læsio Dei*, a violence, a wound inflicted upon God himself, and therefore it is not nothing.

God spake not only of the beasts of the forest, but of those beasts, that is, those brutish affections, that are in us, when He said, *Subjicite et dominamini*—"Subdue and govern the world;" and in sinning we lose this dominion over ourselves, and forfeit our dominion over the creature too. *Qui peccat, quatenus peccat, seipso deterior;* Every sin leaves us worse than it found us, and we rise poorer, ignobler, weaker, for every night's sin than we lay down. *Plerumque non implemus bonum propositum, ne offendamus eos quibuscum vivimus* (Augustine); If any good purpose arise in us, we dare not pursue it, for fear of displeasing those with whom we live, and to whom we have a relation, and a dependence upon them. We sin, and sin, and sin, lest our abstinence from sin should work as an increpation, as a rebuke upon them that do sin; for this they will call an ambition in us that being their inferiors, we go about to be their betters, if we will needs be better, that is, less vicious than they. First then, personally in himself, prophetically in us, David laments our state, *quia peccata*, because we are under sin, sin which is a depravation of man in himself, and a deprivation of God from

* Works, vol. iv., p. 362.

man. And then our next cause of lamentation is the propriety in sin, that they are *nostra*, our own, *Iniquitates meæ*, says David—My sins, mine iniquities are gone over my head.

We are not all Davids, *amabiles*, lovely and beloved in that measure that David was, men according to God's heart; but we are all Adams, *terrestres*, and *lutosi*, earth, and dirty earth, red, and bloody earth, and therefore in ourselves, as derived from him, let us find, and lament all these numbers, and all these weights of sin. Here we are all born to a patrimony, to an inheritance; an inheritance, a patrimony of sin; and we are all good husbands, and thrive too fast upon that stock, upon the increase of sin, even to the treasuring up of sin, and the wrath of God for sin. How naked soever we came out of our mother's womb, otherwise, thus we came all apparelled, apparelled and invested in sin; and we multiply this wardrobe with new habits, habits of customary sins, every day. Every man hath an answer to that question of the apostle, "What hast thou, that thou hast not received from God?" Every man must say, "I have pride in my heart, wantonness in mine eyes, oppression in my hands; and that I never received from God." Our sins are our own; and we have a covetousness of more; a way to make other men's sins ours too, by drawing them to a fellowship in our sins. I must be beholden to the loyalty and honesty of my wife, whether my children be mine own or no; for he whose eye waiteth for the evening, the adulterer, may rob me of that propriety. I must be beholden to the protection of the law, whether my goods shall be mine or no; a potent adversary, a corrupt judge, may rob me of that propriety. I must be beholden to my physician, whether my health and strength shall be mine or no; a garment negligently left off, a disorderly meal may rob me of that propriety. But without asking any man leave, my sins will be my own. When the presumptuous men say—"Our lips are our own, and our tongues are our own" (Psalm xii. 4), the Lord threatens to cut off those lips, and those tongues. But except we do come to say our sins are our own, God will never cut up that root in us, God will never blot out the memory in Himself of those sins. Nothing can make them none of ours, but the avowing of them, the confessing of them to be ours. Only in this way, I am a holy liar, and in this the God of truth will reward my lie; for, if I say my sins are mine own, they are none of mine, but by that confessing and appropriating of those sins to myself, they are made the sins of Him who hath suffered enough for all, my blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Therefore, that servant of God, St Augustine, confesses those sins, which he never did, to be his sins, and to have been forgiven him; *Peccata mihi dimissa fateor, et quæ mea sponte feci, et quæ te duce non feci;* Those sins which I have done, and those which, but for Thy grace, I should have done, are all my sins. Alas, I may die here, and die under an everlasting condemnation of fornication with that woman that lives and dies a virgin, and be damned for a murderer of that man that outlives me, and for a robbery, and oppression, where no man is damnified nor any penny lost. The sin that I have done, the sin that I would have done, is my sin. We must not, therefore, transfer our sins upon any other. We must not think to discharge ourselves upon a *peccata patris;* to come to say, "My father thrived well in this course, why should not I proceed in it? My father was of this religion, why should not I continue in it?" How often is it said in the Scriptures of evil kings, He did evil in the sight of the Lord, and walked *in via patris*, in the way of his father? father in the singular; it is never said plurally, *in via patrum*—in the way of his fathers. God's blessings in this world are expressed so, in the plural, Thou gavest this land *patribus*, to their fathers, says Solomon (1 Kings viii. 48), in the dedication of the temple; and Thou broughtest *patres*, our fathers, out of Egypt; and again, Be with us, Lord, as Thou wast with our fathers; so in Ezekiel (Ezek. xxxvii. 25), Where your fathers dwelt, you, their children, shall dwell too, and your children, and their children's children for ever. His blessings upon His saints, His holy ones in this world, are expressed so, plurally; and so is the transmigration of His saints out of this world also; Thou shalt sleep *cum patribus*, with thy fathers, says God to Moses (Deut. xxxi. 13); and David slept *cum patribus*, with his fathers (1 Kings ii. 10); and Jacob had that care of himself, as of that in which consisted, or in which was testified the blessing of God. I will lie *cum patribus*, with my fathers, and be buried in their burying-place, says Jacob to his son Joseph (Gen. xlviii. 30). Good ways and good ends are in the plural, and have many examples, else they are not good; but sins are in the singular; he walked in the way of his father is in an ill way, but carry our manners, or carry our religion high enough, and we shall find a good rule in our fathers. "Stand in the way," says God in Jeremiah, "and ask for the old way, which is the good way" (Jer. vi. 16). We must put off *veterem hominem*, but not *antiquum;* we may put off that religion which we think old, because it is a little elder than ourselves, and not rely upon that it was the religion of my father. But *antiquissimum dierum*, Him, whose name is He that is, and was, and is for ever, and so involves and enwraps in Himself all the fathers, Him we must put on. Be that our issue with our adversaries at Rome, by the fathers, the fathers in the plural, when those fathers unanimely deliver anything dogmatically for matter of faith, we are content to be tried by the fathers, the fathers in that plural. But by that one father, who begets his children not upon the true mother, the Church, but upon the

court, and so produces articles of faith according as state businesses and civil occasions invite him —by that father we must refuse to be tried; for to limit it in particular to my father, we must say with Nehemiah, *Ego et domus patris mei* (Neh. i. 6). If I make my father's house my church, my father my bishop, I and my father's house have sinned, says he; and with Mordecai to Esther (Esther iv. 14), Thou and thy father's house shall be destroyed.

They are not *peccata patris*, I cannot excuse my sins upon the example of my father; nor are they *peccata temporis*, I cannot discharge my sins upon the times, and upon the present ill disposition that reigns in men now, and do ill because everybody else does so. To say, there is a rot, and therefore the sheep must perish; corruptions in religion are crept in, and work in every corner, and therefore God's sheep, simple souls, must be content to admit the infection of this rot. That there is a murrain, and therefore cattle must die; superstition practised in many places, and therefore the strong servants of God must come to sacrifice their obedience to it, or their blood for it. There is no such rot, no such murrain, no such corruption of times, as can lay a necessity, or can afford an excuse to them who are corrupted with the times. As it is not *pax temporis*, such a state peace, as takes away honour, that secures a nation, nor such a church peace as takes away zeal, that secures a conscience, so neither is it *peccatum temporis*, an observation what other men incline to, but what truth, what integrity thou declinest from, that appertains to thy consideration.

It is not *peccatum ætatis*, not the sin of thy father, not the sin of the times, not the sin of thine own years. That thou shouldest say in thy old age, in excuse of thy covetousness, "All these things have I observed from my youth;" I have lived temperately, continently all my life, and therefore may be allowed one sin for mine ease in mine age. Or that thou shouldest say in thy youth, "I will retire myself in mine age, and live contentedly with a little then; but now, how vain were it to go about to keep out a tide, or to quench the heats and impetuous violence of youth?" But *Fuge juvenilia desideria*—"Fly also youthful lusts" (2 Tim. ii. 22); and lest God hear not thee at last, when thou comest with that petition, "Remember not the sins of my youth" (Psalm xxv. 7); "Remember thou thy Creator now in the days of thy youth" (Eccles. xii. 1); for if thou think it enough to say, "I have but lived as other men have lived, wantonly," thou wilt find some examples to die by too; and die as other old men, old in years and old in sin, have died too, negligently or fearfully, without any sense at all, or all their sense turned into fearful apprehensions and desperation.

They are not *peccata ætatis*, such sins as men of that age must needs commit, nor *peccata artis*, such sins as men of thy calling or thy profession cannot avoid; that thou shouldest say, "I shall not be believed to understand my profession as well as other men, if I live not by it as well as other men do." Is there no being a carpenter but that after he hath warmed him by the chips, and baked and roasted by it, he must needs make an idol of his wood, and worship it? (Isa. xliv. 13.) Is there no being a silversmith, but he must needs make shrines for Diana of the Ephesians, as Demetrius did? (Acts xix. 24.) No being a lawyer without serving the passion of the client? No being a divine without sewing pillows under great men's elbows? It is not the sin of thy calling that oppresses thee; as a man may commit a massacre in a single murder, and kill many in one man, if he kill one upon whom many depended, so is that man a general libeller that defames a lawful calling by his abusing thereof; that lives so scandalously in the ministry as to defame the ministry itself; or so imperiously in the magistracy as to defame the magistracy itself, as though it were but an engine, an instrument of oppression; or so unjustly in any calling, as his abuse dishonours the calling itself. God hath instituted callings for the conservation of order in general, not for the justification of disorders in any particular. For he that justifies his faults by his calling hath not yet received that calling from above, whereby he must be justified and sanctified in the way, and glorified in the end. There is no lawful calling in which a man may not be an honest man.

It is not *peccatum magistratus*, thou canst not excuse thyself upon the unjust command of thy superior; that is the blind and implicit obedience practised in the Church of Rome; nor *peccatum pastoris*, the ill example of thy pastor, whose life counter-preaches his doctrine, for that shall aggravate his, but not excuse thy sin; nor *peccata cæli*, the influence of stars, concluding a fatality, amongst the Gentiles, or such a working of a necessary and inevitable and unconditioned decree of God, as may shut up the ways of a religious walking in this life, or a happy meeting in the life to come. It is none of these; not the sin of thy father, not the sin of the present times, not the sin of thy years and age, nor of thy calling, nor of the magistrates, nor of thy pastor, nor of destiny, nor of decrees, but it is *peccatum tuum*, thy sin, thy own sin. And not only thy sin, so as Adam's sin is communicated to thee by propagation of original sin, for so thou mightest have some colour to discharge thyself upon him, as he did upon Eve, and Eve upon the serpent, though in truth it make no difference, in this spiritual debt of that sin, who is first in the bond. Adam may stand first, but yet thou art no surety, but a principal, and for thyself, and he and thou are equally subject to the penalty. For though St Augustine confess that there are many things concerning original sin of which he is utterly ignorant, yet of this he would have no man ignorant, that to the guiltiness of

original sin our own wills concur, as well as to any actual sin. An involuntary act cannot be a sinful act; and though our will work not now in the admitting of original sin, which enters with our soul in our conception, or in our inanimation and quickening, yet, at first, *Sicut omnium natura, ita omnium voluntates erant in Adam*—As every man was in Adam, so every faculty of every man, and consequently the will of every man, concurred to that sin, which, therefore, lies upon every man now, so that that debt, original sin, is as much thine as his; and for the other debts, which grow out of this debt (as nothing is so generative, so multiplying, as debts are, especially spiritual debts, sins), for actual sins, they are thine, out of thine own choice. Thou mightest have left them undone, and wouldest needs do them; for God never induces any man into a perplexity—that is, into a necessity of doing any particular sin. Thou couldest have dissuaded a son, or a friend, or a servant, from that sin which thou hast embraced thyself; thou hast been so far from having been forced to those sins which thou hast done, as that thou hast been sorry thou couldest not do them in a greater measure. They are thine—thine own, so as that thou canst not discharge thyself upon the devil, but art, by the habit of sin, become *spontaneus dæmon* (Chrysostom), a devil to thyself, and wouldest minister temptations to thyself, though there were no other devil. And this is our propriety in sin; they are our own.

This is the propriety of thy sin; the next is the plurality, the multiplicity, *iniquitates;* not only the committing of one sin often; and yet he deceives himself in his account dangerously that reckons but upon one sin, because he is guilty but of one kind of sin. Would a man say he had but one wound if he were shot seven times in the same place? Could the Jews deny that they flayed Christ with their second, or third, or twentieth blow, because they had torn skin and flesh with their former scourges, and had left nothing but bones to wound? But it is not only that, the repeating of the same sin often, but it is the multiplicity of divers kinds of sins that is here lamented in all our behalfs. It is not when the conscience is tender, and afraid of every sin, and every appearance of sin. When Naaman desired pardon of God by the prophet, for sustaining the king upon his knees in the house of Rimmon the idol, and the prophet bade him "go in peace" (2 Kings v. 19), it is not that he allows him any peace under the conscience and guiltiness of a sin; that was indispensable (*i.e.*, not within the power of a dispensation). Neither is there any dispensation in Naaman's case, but only a rectifying of a tender and timorous conscience, that thought that to be a sin which was not if it went no further, but to the exhibiting of a civil duty to his master, in what place soever, religious or profane, that service of kneeling were to be done. Naaman's service was truly no sin; but it had been a sin in him to have done it when he thought it to be a sin. And therefore the prophet's phrase, "Go in peace," may well be interpreted so,—Set thy mind at rest; for all that, that thou requirest may be done without sin. Now that tenderness is not in our case in the text. He that proceeds so to examine all his actions, may meet scruples all the way that may give him some anxiety and vexation, but he shall never come to that overflowing of sin intended in this plurality and multiplicity here. For this plurality, this multiplicity of sin, hath found first a sponginess in the soul, an aptness to receive any liquor, to embrace any sin, that is offered to it; and after a while, a hunger and thirst in the soul, to hunt, and pant, and draw after a temptation, and not to be able to endure any *vacuum*, any discontinuance, or intermission of sin: and he will come to think it a melancholic thing still to stand in fear of hell; a sordid, a yeomanly thing, still to be ploughing, and weeding, and worming a conscience; a mechanical thing, still to be removing logs, or filing iron, still to be busied in removing occasions of temptation, or filing and clearing particular actions: and at last he will come to that case which St Augustine, out of an abundant ingenuity, and tenderness, and compunction, confesses of himself—*Ne vituperarer, vitiosior fiebam*, I was fain to sin, lest I should lose my credit, and be undervalued; *Et ubi non suberat, quo admisso, æquarer perditis*, When I had no means to do some sins, whereby I might be equal to my fellow, *Fingebam ne fecisse quod non feceram, ne viderer abjectior, quo innocentior*, I would belie myself, and say I had done that which I never did, lest I should be undervalued for not having done it. *Audiebam eos, exaltantes flagitia*, says that tender, blessed father, I saw it was thought wit to make sonnets of their own sins, *Et libebat facere, non libidine facti, sed libidine laudis*, I sinned, not for the pleasure I had in the sin, but for the pride that I had to write feelingly of it. O what a leviathan is sin, how vast, how immense a body! And then what a spawner, how numerous! Between these two, the denying of sins which we have done, and the bragging of sins which we have not done, what a space, what a compass is there, for millions of millions of sins! And so have you the nature of sin, which was our first; the propriety of sin, which was our second; and the plurality, the multiplicity of sin, which was our third branch; and follows next the exaltation thereof; *Supergressæ sunt*—"My sins are gone over my head."

They are, that is, they are already got above us; for in that case we consider this plural, this manifold sinner, that he hath slipped his time of preventing, or resisting his sins; his habits of sins are got, already got above him. Elijah bids his man look towards the sea, and he saw

nothing; he bids him look again, and again to a seventh time, and he saw nothing (1 Kings xviii. 43). After all, he sees but a little cloud, like a man's hand; and yet, upon that little appearance, the prophet warns the king, to get him into his chariot, and make good haste away, lest the rain stopped his passage, for instantly the heaven was black with clouds and rain. The sinner will see nothing, till he can see nothing; and, when he sees anything (as to the blindest conscience something will appear), he thinks it but a little cloud, but a melancholic fit, and, in an instant (for seven years make but an instant to that man, that thinks of himself but once in seven years), *supergressæ sunt*, his sins are got above him, and his way out is stopped. The sun is got over us now, though we saw none of his motions, and so are our sins, though we saw not their steps. You know how confident our adversaries are in that argument, "Why do ye oppugn our doctrine of prayer for the dead, or of invocation of saints, or of the fire of purgatory, since you cannot assign us a time when these doctrines came into the Church, or that they were opposed or contradicted when they entered?" When a conscience comes to that inquisition, to an *iniquitates supergressæ*, to consider that our sins are gone over our head in any of those ways which we have spoken of, if we offer to awaken that conscience further, it startles, and it answers us drowsily, or frowardly, like a new waked man, "Can you remember when you sinned this sin first, or did you resist it then, or since?" Whence comes this troublesome singularity now? Pray let me sleep still, says this startled conscience. Beloved, if we fear not the wetting of our foot in sin, it will be too late, when we are over head and ears. God's deliverance of His children was *sicco pede*, He made the sea dry land, and "they wet not their foot" (Exod. xiv. 22). At first, in the creation, *Subjecit omnia sub pedibus*—"God put all things under their feet" (Psalm viii. 7); in man's ways, in this world, His angels bear us up in their hands; why? *Ne impingamus pedem*—"That we should not hurt our foot against a stone, but have a care of every step we make." If thou have defiled thy feet (strayed into any unclean ways) wash them again, and stop there, and that will bring thee to the consideration of the spouse, "I have washed my feet, how shall I then defile them again?" (Cant. v. 3.) I have found mercy for my former sins, how shall I dare to provoke God with more? Still God appoints us a permanent means to tread sin under our feet here, in this life; the woman, that is, the Church, hath the moon, that is, all transitory things (and so, all temptations) under her feet (Rev. xii. 1); as Christ himself expressed His care of Peter to consist in that, that if his feet were washed all was clean; and as in His own person He admitted nails in His feet, as well as in His hands, so crucify thy hands, abstain from unjust actions, but crucify thy feet too, make not one step towards the way of idolaters, or other sinners. If we watch not the *ingressus sum*, we shall be insensible of the *supergressæ sunt;* if we look not to a sin when it comes towards us, we shall not be able to look towards it when it is got over us: for, if a man come to walk in the counsel of the ungodly, he will come to sit in the seat of the scornful; for that is the sinner's progress, in the first warning that David gives in the beginning of his first psalm. If he give himself leave to enter into sinful ways, he will sit and sin at ease, and make a jest of sin; and he that loveth danger shall perish therein. So have you then the nature of sin; it was sin that oppressed him; and the propriety of sin, it was his sin, actual sin; and the plurality of sin, habitual, customary sin; and the victory of sin, they had been long climbing, and were now got up to a height; and this height and exaltation of theirs is expressed thus, *Super caput*—"Mine iniquities are got above my head."

THE ELECT.*

But who are this *We?* why, they are the elect of God. But who are they, who are these elect? *Qui timidè rogat, docet negare;* if a man ask me with a diffidence, Can I be the adopted son of God that have rebelled against Him in all my affections, that have trodden upon His commandments in all mine actions, that have divorced myself from Him in preferring the love of His creatures before Himself; that have murmured at His corrections, and thought them too much; that have undervalued His benefits, and thought them too little; that have abandoned and prostituted my body, His temple, to all uncleanness, and my spirit to indevotion and contempt of His ordinances; can I be the adopted son of God that have done this? *Ne timide roges*, ask me not this with a diffidence and distrust in God's mercy, as if thou thoughtest, with Cain, thy iniquities were greater than could be forgiven; but ask me with that holy confidence which belongs to a true convert, Am not I, who though I am never without sin, yet am never without hearty remorse and repentance for my sins; though the weakness of my flesh sometimes betrays me, the strength of His Spirit still recovers me; though my body be under the paw of that lion that seeks whom he may devour, yet the Lion of Judah raises again and upholds my soul; though I wound my Saviour with many sins, yet all these, be they never so many, I strive against, I lament, confess, and forsake as far as I am able; am not I the child of God, and His adopted son in this state? *Roga fidenter*, ask me with a holy confidence in thine and my God, *et doces affirmare*, thy very question gives me mine answer to thee; thou teachest me to

* Works, p. 833.

say, thou art. God teaches me to say so by His apostle, The foundation of God is sure, and this is the seal; God knoweth who are His, and let them that call upon His name depart from all iniquity. He that departs so far, as to repent former sins, and shut up the ways which he knows in his conscience do lead him into temptations, he is one of this *quorum;* one of us, one of them who are adopted by Christ to be the sons of God. I am of this *quorum*, if I preach the Gospel sincerely, and live thereafter (for he preaches twice a day that follows his own doctrine, and does as he says), and you are of this *quorum*, if you preach over the sermons which you hear, to your own souls in your meditation, to your families in your relation, to the world in your conversation. If you come to this place to meet the Spirit of God, and not to meet one another; if you have sat in this place with a delight in the Word of God, and not in the word of any speaker; if you go out of this place in such a disposition as that, if you should meet the last trumpets at the gates, and Christ Jesus in the clouds, you would not entreat Him to go back, and stay another year; to enwrap all in one, if you have a religious and sober assurance that you are His, and walk according to your belief, you are His; and, as the fulness of time, so the fulness of grace is come upon you, and you are not only within the first commission, of those who were under the law, and so redeemed, but of this *quorum*, who are selected out of them, the adopted sons of that God, who never disinherits those that forsake not Him.

JOSEPH HALL.

1574-1656.

GOD'S VINEYARD.*

Lay now all these together, *And what could have been done more for* our *vineyard*, O God, *that Thou hast not done?* Look about you, honourable and Christian hearers, and see whether God hath done thus with any nation. Oh, never, never was any people so bound to a God. Other neighbouring regions would think themselves happy in one drop of those blessings which have poured down thick upon us. Alas! they are in a vaporous and marish vale, while we are seated on the fruitful hill; they lie open to the massacring knife of an enemy, while we are fenced; they are clogged with miserable encumbrances, while we are free; briers and brambles overspread them, while we are choicely planted; their tower is of offence, their winepress is of blood. Oh, the lamentable condition of more likely vineyards than our own! Who can but weep and bleed to see those woful calamities that are fallen upon the late famous and flourishing churches of Reformed Christendom? Oh, for that Palatine vine, late inoculated with a precious bud of our royal stem—that vine, not long since rich in goodly clusters, now the insultation of boars and prey of foxes! Oh, for those poor distressed Christians in France, Bohemia, Silesia, Moravia, Germany, Austria, the Valteline, that groan now under the tyrannous yoke of anti-Christian oppression! How glad would they be of the crumbs of our feasts! How rich would they esteem themselves with the very gleanings of our plentiful crop of prosperity! How do they look up at us, as even now militantly triumphant, while they are miserably wallowing in dust and blood, and wonder to see the sunshine upon our hill, while they are drenched with storm and tempest in the valley!

What are we, O God, what are we that Thou shouldest be thus rich in Thy mercies to us, while Thou art so severe in Thy judgments upon them? It is too much, Lord, it is too much that Thou hast done for so sinful and rebellious a people.

2. Cast now your eyes aside a little, and, after the view of God's favours, see some little glimpse of our REQUITAL. Say then, say, *O nation not worthy to be beloved*, what fruit have ye returned to your beneficent God? Sin is impudent; but let me challenge the impudent forehead of sin itself. Are they not sour and wild grapes that we have yielded? Are we less deep in the sins of Israel than in Israel's blessings? Complaints, I know, are unpleasing, however just, but now not more unpleasing than necessary. "Woe is me, my mother, that thou hast borne me a man of contention" (Jer. xv. 10). I must cry out in this sad day of the sins of my people.

The searchers of Canaan, when they came to the brook of Eshcol, they cut down a branch, with a cluster of grapes, and carried it on a staff between two, to show Israel the fruit of the land (Num. xiii. 23). Give me leave, in the search of our Israel, to present your eyes with some of the wild grapes that grow there on every hedge. And what if they be the very same that grew in this degenerated vineyard of Israel?

Where we meet, first, with oppression, a lordly sin, and that challengeth precedency, as being

* From a Sermon preached before the House of Lords.

commonly incident to none but the great; though a poor oppressor (as he is unkindly, so he) is he a monster of mercilessness. Oh, the loud shrieks and clamours of this crying sin! What grinding of faces, what racking of rents, what detention of wages, what enclosing of commons, what engrossing of commodities, what griping exactions, what straining the advantages of greatness, what unequal levies of legal payments, what spiteful suits, what depopulations, what usuries, what violences abound everywhere! The sighs, the tears, the blood of the poor, pierce the heavens and call for a fearful retribution. This is a sour grape indeed, and that makes God to wring His face in an angry detestation.

Drunkenness is the next—not so odious in the weakness of it, as in the strength. Oh, woful glory! *Strong to drink.* Woe is me! how is the world turned beast! What bousing and quaffing, and whiffing, and healthing is there on every bench, and what reeling and staggering in our streets! What drinking by the yard, the die, the dozen! What forcing of pledges! what quarrels for measure and form! How is that become an excuse of villainy, which any villainy might rather excuse—"I was drunk!" How hath this torrent, yea, this deluge of excess in meats and drinks drowned the face of the earth, and risen many cubits above the highest mountains of religion and good laws! Yea, would God I might not say that which I fear and shame and grieve to say, that even some of them which square the ark for others, have been inwardly drowned, and discovered their nakedness. That other inundation scoured the world; this impures it. And what but a deluge of fire can wash it from so abominable filthiness?

Let no popish eavesdropper now smile to think what advantage I give by so deep a censure of our own profession. Alas! these sins know no difference of religions. Would God they themselves were not rather more deep in these foul enormities! We extenuate not our guilt—whatever we sin, we condemn it as mortal; they palliate wickedness with the fair pretence of veniality. Shortly, they accuse us; we, them; God, both.

But where am I? How easy is it for a man to lose himself in the sins of the time! It is not for me to have my habitation in these black tents; let me pass through them running. Where can a man cast his eye, not to see that which may vex his soul?

Here, bribery and corruption in the seats of judicature; there, perjuries at the bar; here, partiality and unjust connivancy in magistrates; there, disorder in those that should be teachers; here, sacrilege in patrons; there, simoniacal contracts in unconscionable Levites; here, bloody oaths and execrations; there, scurril profaneness; here, cozening in bargains; there, breaking of promises; here, perfidious underminings; there, flattering supparasitations; here, pride in both sexes, but especially the weaker; there, luxury and wantonness; here, contempt of God's messengers; there, neglect of His ordinances, and violation of His days. The time and my breath would sooner fail me than this woful bead-roll of wickedness.

FASHIONS OF THE WORLD.*

If we love the world more than God, if we hate any enemy more than sin, if we grieve at any loss more than of the favour of God, if we joy in anything more than the writing of our names in heaven, if we fear anything more than offence, if we hope for anything more than salvation, and, much more, if we change objects, loving what we should hate, joying in what we should grieve at, hoping for what we should fear, and the contrary—in one word, if our desires and affections be earthly, grovelling, sensual, not spiritual, sublime, heavenly, we fall into the fashion of the world. Let the world dote upon vanity, and follow after lies; let our affections and conversation be above, where Christ Jesus sitteth at the right hand of God. Let the base earthworms of this world be taken up with the best of this vain trash, the desires of us Christians must soar aloft, and fix themselves upon those objects which may make us perfectly and unchangeably blessed. Thus fashion not your hearts to the carnal desires and affections of the world.

LIFE A SOJOURNING.†

A man that sojourns abroad in a strange country finds himself no way interested in their designs and proceedings. What cares he who rises or falls at their court? who is in favour, and who in disgrace, what ordinances or laws are made, and what are repealed? He says still to himself as our Saviour said to Peter, "What is that to thee?" Thus doth the Christian here. He must use the world as if he used it not; he must pass through the affairs of this life without being entangled in them, as remembering who and where he is—that he is but a sojourner here.

No man that goes to sojourn in a strange country will carry his lumber along with him, but makes over his money, by exchange, to receive it where he is going. Ye rich men that cannot think to carry your pelf with you into heaven; no, it were well if you could get in yourselves without that cumbrous load; it may keep you out—it cannot carry you in.

If we be strangers and pilgrims here, we cannot but have a good mind homeward. It is

---

* "Fashion not yourselves like to this world" (Rom. xii. 2).

† "If ye call on the Father, who, without respect of persons, judgeth according to every man's work; pass the time of your sojourning here in fear" (1 Peter i. 17).

natural to us all to be dearly affectioned to our home. I must tell you it is no good sign if we be loath to go home to our Father's house.

It is a true observation of Seneca, *Velocitas temporis*, saith he, "The quick speed of time is best discerned when we look at it past and gone;" and this I can confirm to you by experience. It hath pleased the providence of my God so to contrive it that this day, this very morning, fourscore years ago, I was born into the world. "A great time since," you are ready to say, and so indeed it seems to you that look at it forward; but to me, that look at it as past, it seems so short that it is gone like a tale that is told, or a dream by night, and looks but like yesterday.

It can be no offence for me to say that many of you who hear me this day are not like to see so many suns walk over your heads as I have done; yea, what speak I of this? There is not one of us that can assure himself of his continuance here one day. We are all tenants at will, and, for aught we know, may be turned out of these clay cottages at an hour's warning. Oh then, what should we do, but, as wise farmers who know the time of their lease is expiring and cannot be renewed, carefully and seasonably provide ourselves of a surer and more during tenure?

I remember our witty countryman, Bromiard, tells us of a lord in his time that had a fool in his house, as many great men in those days had for their pleasure, to whom this lord gave a staff, and charged him to keep it till he should meet with one that were more fool than himself, and if he met with such a one, to deliver it over to him. Not many years after, this lord fell sick, and indeed was sick unto death. His fool came to see him, and was told by his sick lord that he must now shortly leave him. "And whither wilt thou go?" said the fool. "Into another world," said the lord. "And when wilt thou come again? within a month?" "No." "Within a year?" "No." "When, then?" "Never." "Never! and what provision hast thou made for thy entertainment there whither thou goest?" "None at all." "No!" said the fool, "none at all! Here, take my staff. Art thou going away for ever, and hast taken no order nor care how thou shalt speed in that other world, whence thou shalt never return? Take my staff, for I am not guilty of any such folly as this."

And, indeed, there cannot be a greater folly, or madness rather, than to be so wholly taken up with an eager regard for these earthly vanities, which we cannot hold, as to utterly neglect the care of that eternity which we can never forego. And, consider well of it, upon this moment of our life depends that eternity either way.

My dear brethren, it is a great way to heaven, and we have but a little time to get thither. God says to us, as the angel said to Elijah, "Up, for thou hast a great journey to go;" and if, as I fear, we have loitered in the way, and trifled away any part of the time in vain impertinences, we have so much more need to gird up our loins and hasten our pace. Let us, therefore, in the fear of God, be exhorted to recollect ourselves; and since we find ourselves guilty of the sinful misspence of our good hours, let us, while we have pace, obtain of ourselves to be careful of redeeming that precious time we have lost. As the widow of Sarepta, when she had but a little oil left in her cruse and a little meal in her barrel, was careful of spending that to the best advantage, so let us, considering that we have but a little sand left in our glass, a short remainder of our mortal life, be sure to employ it unto the best profit of our souls, so that every one of our hours may carry up with it a happy testimony of our gainful improvement, that so, when our day cometh, we may change our time for eternity, the time of our sojourning for the eternity of glory and blessedness.

SIR JOHN ELIOT.

1590-1632.

RELIGION AND THE STATE.*

THE strength of all government is religion; for though policy may secure a kingdom against foreigners (and so I pray God this kingdom may always stand secure), and wisdom may provide all necessaries for the rule and government at home; yet if religion season not the affections of the people, the danger is as much in our own Achitophels, as from Moab and all the armies of the Philistines. Religion it is that keeps the subject in obedience, as being taught by God to

* This was Eliot's first speech after the accession of Charles I., and was delivered in Parliament, June 1625. Speaking of his style of oratory, John Forster remarks: "His vivacity was equal to his earnestness, yet never so displayed as to detract from it. He had in great perfection some of the highest qualities of an orator, singular power of statement, clearness and facility in handling details, pointed classical allusion, keen and logical argument, forcible and rich declamation; but in none of these does he at any time seem, however briefly, to indulge merely for its own sake. All are subordinated to the design and the matter in hand."

honour His vicegerents. *A religando* it is called, as the common obligation among men; the tie of all friendship and society; the bond of all office and relation; writing every duty in the conscience, which is the strictest of all laws. Both the excellency and necessity hereof, the heathens knew that knew not true religion; and therefore, in their politics, they had it always for a maxim. A shame it were for us to be therein less intelligent than they! And if we truly know it, we cannot but be affectionate in this case. Two things are considerable therein; the purity, and the unity thereof: the first respecting only God, the other both God and man. For, where there is division in religion, as it does wrong divinity so it makes distractions among men. It dissolves all ties and obligations, civil and natural; the observation of Heaven being more powerful than either policy or blood. For the purity of religion, in this place I need not speak; seeing how beautiful the memories of our fathers are therein made by their endeavours. For the unity, I wish posterity might say we had preserved for them, that which was left to us.

What divisions, what factions, nay, what fractions in religion, this kingdom does now suffer, I need not recapitulate. What divisions, what transactions, what alienations have been made, no man can be ignorant. How many members, in that point, have been dissected from this body, I mean the body of the land (which representatively we are), so the body itself, though healthy, cannot but seem lame. How have those members studied to be incorporate with others? How have they threatened us, their own, not only by presumption, but in greatness; and given us fear, more than they have taken? Blessed be that hand that has delivered us! Blessed this day that gives us hope, wherein the danger and infection may be stayed. For, without present remedy, the disease will scarce be curable. To effect this, the cause must first be sought from whence the sickness springs; and that will be best found in the survey of the laws. Certainly it lies in the laws, or in the manner of their execution. Either there is some defect or imperfection in the laws; or their life, the execution of them is remitted. For, if the laws be perfect, how can division enter but by a breach of them; if the execution be observed, how can the laws be broken? Therefore in this does rest the cause, and here must be the remedy. To that end, now, my motion shall incline; for a review of the laws, and a special consideration as to their present inefficacy. If the division have got in by imperfection of the laws, I desire they may be amended; if by defect, that they may be supplied; and if (as I most do fear it) through neglect and want of execution, I pray the House to give direction that the power may be enforced with some great mulct and penalty on the ministers, who for that will be more vigilant, and we thereby secure.

NATIONAL GRIEVANCES AND THE IMPEACHMENT OF BUCKINGHAM, 1625-26.

My Lords, you have heard, in the labours of these two days spent in this service, a representation from the knights, citizens, and burgesses of the Commons House of Parliament, of their apprehensions of the present evils and sufferings of this kingdom; of the causes of those evils; and of those causes the application made to the person of the Duke of Buckingham; so clearly and fully, that I presume your Lordships now expect rather I should conclude than that anything more or further should be added to the charge.

You have heard how his ambition has been expressed, by procuring the great offices of strength and power in this kingdom, and in effect getting the government of the whole into his own hands. You have heard by what practices and means he has attained them, and how money has stood for merit. How they have been executed, how performed, it needs no argument but the common sense. To the miseries and misfortunes which we suffer therein, I will add but this: that the right, the title of the seas, the ancient inheritance of our princes, the honour of this land, lost or impeached, makes it too apparent, too much known. I need not further press it. But from hence my observation must descend upon his other virtues, as they come extracted from those articles which you have had delivered. And this by way of perspective I will give so near and shortly, that I hope your Lordships shall conceive it rather an ease and help to excitate your memories than to oppress your patience.

My Lords, I will take the inward characters, the patterns of his mind, as you have heard them opened. And first, his collusion and deceit; crimes in themselves so odious and uncertain, that the ancients, knowing not by what name to term them, expressed them in a metaphor, calling them *stellionatus*, from a discoloured beast so doubtful in appearance that they knew not what to make of it. And thus, in this man's practice, we find it here. Take it in the business of Rochelle. First to the merchants, by his arts and fair persuasions drawn with their ships to Dieppe, there to be entrapped. Then to the King and State, with shadows and pretences colouring that foul design which secretly he had plotted against Rochelle and religion. Then to the Parliament, after his work was finished or in motion, and the ships given up into the Frenchmen's hands, not only in disguising but denying the truth of that he knew. A practice as dangerous, as dishonourable to us both in the precedence and act, as in the effect and consequence it proved prejudicial and ruinous to our friends.

The next presented was his high oppression,

and this of strange latitude and extent; not unto men alone, but to the laws, nay, to the State. The pleasure of his Majesty, his known directions, his public acts, his acts of council, the decrees of courts—all must be made inferior to this man's will. No right, no interest, may withstand him. Through the powers of State and justice he has dared ever to strike at his own ends. Your Lordships have had this sufficiently expressed in the case of the "St Peter," and by the ships at Dieppe. . . .

My Lords, I shall here desire you to observe one particular more than formerly was pressed, concerning the duty of his place in this. Supposing he might, without fault, have sent those ships away, especially the King's; supposing that he had not thereby injured the merchants, or misinformed the King, or abused the Parliament; supposing even that he had not done that worse than all this, of now seeking to excuse himself therein by entitling it to his Majesty; nay, my Lords, I will say that if his Majesty himself were pleased to have consented or to have commanded, which I cannot believe, yet this could no way satisfy for the Duke, or make any extenuation of the charge. For it was the duty of his place to have opposed it by his prayers, and to have interceded with his Majesty to make known the dangers, the ill consequences that might follow. And if this prevailed not, should he have ended there? No; he should then have addressed himself to your Lordships, your Lordships sitting in council, and there have made it known, there have desired *your* aids! Nor, if in this he sped not, should he have rested without entering before you a protestation for himself, that he was not consenting. This was the duty of his place; this has been the practice of his elders; and this, being here neglected, leaves him without excuse. I have heard it further indeed spoken as excuse, that the ships are now come home; but give me leave, I beseech your Lordships, in prevention to object to that (though I confess I know it not), that it lessens not his fault. It may commend the French, but cannot excuse him, whose error was in sending them away. When the French once had them they might have kept them still, for aught I know, notwithstanding all his greatness. Certainly we do know only too well that they executed, to perfection, their work against Rochelle and religion.

The next your Lordships had was his extortion, his unjust exaction of £10,000 from the East India merchants without right or colour. And this you heard exquisitely expressed by the gentleman who had that part in charge, who mathematically observed the reason upon which it proceeded and was enforced. He revealed to you that secret of the seas in taking of the wind, which at the Cape they have at known and certain times; and many of your Lordships would probably observe that the skill so timely used was gotten recently in the late voyage, to which you know who sent him.* . . .

Because I hear a mention of the King's sacred name in this, I must crave your Lordships' leave thus far to digress as here to make this protestation, which I had in charge from my masters the knights, citizens, and burgesses of the Commons House of Parliament, that in nothing we intend to reflect the least ill odour on his Majesty or his most blessed father of happy memory, but with all honour of their names we do admire them, and only strive to vindicate their fames from such as would eclipse them.

After this, my Lords, followed the corruption, the sordid bribery of him whom I now charge, in the sale of honours, in the sale of offices. That which was the ancient crown of virtue is now made merchantable, and justice itself is a prey to this man. All which particulars, as you have heard them opened and enforced with their several circumstances, reasons, and proofs, to show what in themselves they are, what in their consequences, and what they may now merit, I presume I need not to dilate, but, your Lordships knowing all so well, leave them to your judgment. . . .

And from hence I am raised to observe a wonder, a wonder both in policy and nature. For not less is it that this man, so notorious in ill, so dangerous in the state, so disproportionable both to the time and government, has been able to subsist and keep a being. But as I confess it for a wonder, so must there also have been art to help and underprop it, or it could not have continued so long, To that end, therefore, your Lordships will have noted that he made a party. He made a party in the court, a party in the country, a party in almost all the places of government, both foreign and at home. He raised, and preferred to honours and commands, those of his own alliance, the creatures of his kindred and affection, how mean soever; whilst others, though most deserving, nay, all that were not in this compass, he crossed and opposed. And having thus drawn to himself a power of parties, a power of honours, a power of offices, and in effect the powers of the whole kingdom whether for peace or war; and having used these to strengthen and add to his alliances; he then, for his further aggrandisement, set upon the revenues of the Crown, interrupting, exhausting, and consuming that fountain of supply. He broke those nerves and sinews of the land, the stores and treasures of the King.† That which

* "In allusion to Glanville, who had been sent, upon compulsory appointment, by way of punishment, and to prevent his possible election to Parliament, as secretary to the fleet in the Cadiz expedition."—*Forster.*

† "'The proud carriage' of the Duke provoked an invective from Eliot which marks a new era in Parliamentary speech. From the first the vehemence and passion of his words had contrasted with the grave, colourless reasoning of older speakers. His opponents

is the blood and spirit of the kingdom, he wasted and consumed. Not only to satisfy himself, his own desires and avarice, but to satiate others with pride and luxury, he emptied those veins in which the kingdom's blood should run, and by diversion of its proper course cast the body of the land into a deep consumption. This your Lordships saw in the opening of that point concerning the revenues. What vast treasures he has gotten, what infinite sums of money, and what a mass of lands! If your Lordships please to calculate, you will find it all amounting to little less than the whole of the subsidies which the King has had within that time. A lamentable example of the subjects' bounties so to be employed! But is this all? No; your Lordships may not think it. These are but collections of a short view, used only as an epitome for the rest. There needs no search for it. It is too visible. His profuse expenses, his superfluous feasts, his magnificent buildings, his riots, his excesses, what are they but the visible evidences of an express exhausting of the State, a chronicle of the immensity of his waste of the revenues of the Crown! No wonder, then, our King is now in want, this man abounding so. And as long as he abounds, the King must still be wanting.

But having thus prevailed in wealth and honours he rests not there. Ambition has no bounds, but like a violent flame breaks still beyond; snatches at all, assumes new boldness, gives itself more scope. Not satisfied with the injuring of justice, with the wrongs of honour, with the prejudice of religion, with the abuse of State, with the misappropriation of revenues, his attempts go higher, even to the person of his sovereign. You have before you his making practice on that, in such a manner and with such effect as I fear to speak it, nay, I doubt and hesitate to think it. In which respect I shall leave it, as Cicero did the like; *ne gravioribus utar verbis quam natura fert, aut levioribus quam causa postulat.* The examination with your Lordships will show you what it is. I need not name it. . . .

In all these now your Lordships have the idea of the man; what in himself he is, and what in his affections. You have seen his power, and some, I fear, have felt it. You have known his practice, you have heard the effects. It rests then to be considered, being such, what he is in relation to the King, what in relation to the State, and how compatible or incompatible with either. What he is to the King, you have heard; a canker in his treasures, and one that restlessly consumes and will devour him. What he is to the State, you have seen; a moth to goodness, not only persisting in all ill ways but preventing better. His affections are apparent not to be the best, and his actions prove it. What hopes or expectation, then, he gives, I leave it to your Lordships. I will now only see, by comparison with others, where I may find him paralleled or likened; and, so considering what may now become him, from thence render your Lordships to a short conclusion.

Of all the precedents I can find, none so near resembles him as doth Sejanus; and him Tacitus describes thus: that he was *audax; sui obtegens, in alios criminator; juxta adulatio et superbia.* If your Lordships please to measure him by this, pray see in what they vary. He is bold. We had that experience lately; and of such a boldness, I dare be bold to say, as is seldom heard of. He is secret in his purposes, and more; that we have showed already. Is he a slanderer? is he an accuser? I wish this Parliament had not felt it, nor that which was before. And for his pride and flattery, what man can judge the greater? Thus far, I think, the parallel holds. But now, I beseech your Lordships, look a little further. Of Sejanus it is likewise noted, amongst his policies, amongst his arts, that to support himself he did *clientes suos honoribus aut provinciis ornare.* He preferred his friends, he preferred his clients, to second, to assist him; and does not this man do the like? Is it not, and in the same terms, a special cause in our complaint now? Does not this kingdom, does not Scotland, does not Ireland speak it? I will observe but one thing more, and end. It is a note upon the pride of Sejanus, upon his high ambition, which your Lordships will find set down by Tacitus. His solecisms, his neglect of counsels, his veneries, his venefices,* these I will not mention here, only that particular of his pride, which thus I find. In his public passages and relations he would so mix his business with the prince's, seeming to confound their actions, that he was often styled *laborum imperatoris socius:* and does not this man do the like? Is it not in his whole practice? How often, how lately have we heard it! Did he not, in this same place, in this very Parliament, under colour of an explanation for the King, before the committees of both Houses, do the same? Have not your Lordships heard him also ever mixing and confusing the King and the State, not leaving a distinction between them? It is too, too manifest.

My Lords, I have done. You see the man! What have been his actions, whom he is like, you know. I leave him to your judgments. This only is conceived by us, the knights, citizens, and burgesses of the Commons House of

complained that Eliot aimed to 'stir up affections.' The quick emphatic sentences he substituted for the cumbrous periods of the day, his rapid argument, his vivacious and caustic allusions, his passionate appeals, his fearless invective, struck a new note in English eloquence."—*John Richard Green.*

* "Such expressions could not of course have been directly applied to Buckingham. They are insinuated only through Sejanus. In the report in the journals this point is missed, and the effect wholly lost. But so it is throughout."—*Forster.*

parliament, that by him came all our evils, in him we find the causes, and on him must be the remedies. To this end we are now addressed to your Lordships in confidence of your justice, to which some late examples* and your wisdoms invite us. We cannot doubt your Lordships. The greatness, the power, the practice of the whole world, we know to be all inferior to your greater judgments; and from thence we take assurance. To that, therefore, we now refer him, there to be examined, there to be tried; and in due time from thence we shall expect such judgment as his cause merits.

And now, my Lords, I will conclude with a particular censure given on the Bishop of Ely in the time of Richard I. That prelate had the King's treasures at his command, and had luxuriously abused them. His obscure kindred were married to earls, barons, and others of great rank and place. No man's business could be done without his help. He would not suffer the King's counsel to advise in the highest affairs of State. He gave *ignotis personis et obscuris* the custody of castles and great trusts. He ascended to such a height of insolence and pride that he ceased to be fit for characters of mercy. And therefore, says the record of which I now hold the original—*Per totam insulam publicè proclametur; Pereat qui perdere cuncta festinat. Opprimatur ne omnes opprimat.*

And now, my Lords, I am to read unto your Lordships the conclusion of this charge, and so to present it to you:

"And the said Commons, by protestation saving to themselves the liberty of exhibiting at any time hereafter any other accusations or impeachment against the said Duke; and also of replying unto the answer that the said Duke shall make unto the said articles, or to any of them, and of offering further proofs also of the premises, or any of them, as the case shall require, according to the course of Parliament: do pray that the said Duke may be put to answer to all and every the said premises, and that such proceeding, examination, trial, and judgment may be upon every of them had and used as is agreeable to law and justice."

And having discharged this trust, my Lords, imposed upon me, unworthy of that honour; and having therein, in the imperfections which naturally I suffer, made myself too open to your Lordships' censure; I must now crave your pardons and become a petitioner for myself, that those weaknesses which have appeared in my delivery may, through your noble favours, find excuse. For which, as that gentleman my colleague who first began made his apology by colour of command, mine, my Lords, is likewise spoken in my obedience. I was commanded, and I have obeyed. Wherein let me desire your Lordships that, notwithstanding the errors of which I may be guilty, nothing may reflect upon my masters; or be from thence admitted into your Lordships' judgments to diminish or impeach the reputation of their wisdoms. These, I hope, shall give your Lordships and the world such ample testimonies as may approve them still to be deserving in the ancient merits of their fathers. This for them I crave; and for myself I humbly submit in confidence of your favours.*

* "The allusion is to the impeachments of Bacon and Middlesex."—*Forster.*

STATE OF THE NATION, 1628.†

MR SPEAKER,—We sit here as the great Council of the King, and, in that capacity, it is our duty to take into consideration the state and affairs of the kingdom, and when there is occasion to give a true representation of them, by way of counsel and advice, with what we conceive necessary or expedient to be done.

In this consideration, I confess many a sad thought hath affrighted me, and that not only in respect of our dangers from abroad (which yet I know are great, as they have been often pressed and dilated to us), but in respect of our disorders here at home, which do enforce those dangers, and by which they are occasioned. For I believe I shall make it clear to you, that both at first the cause of these dangers were our disorders, and our disorders now are yet our greatest dangers; that not so much the potency of our enemies, as the weakness of ourselves, doth threaten us, so that the saying of one of the Fathers may be assumed by us, *Non tam potentiâ suâ quam negligentiâ nostrâ*—"Not so much by their power as by our neglect." Our want of true devotion to Heaven, our insincerity and doubting in religion, our want of councils, our precipitate actions, the insufficiency or unfaithfulness of our generals abroad, ignorance and corruption of our ministers at home, the impoverishing of the sovereign, the oppression and depression of the subject, the exhausting of our treasures, the waste of our provisions, consumption of our ships, destruction of our men—these make the advantage of our enemies, not the reputation of their arms; and if in these there

* The original MS. of this speech was discovered at Port Eliot, with this indorsement in his own hand: "Keepe this safe where it may not be lost." It was at that time the custom of Parliamentary orators, as Thomas Fuller has remarked, "that gentlemen speakers in these Parliaments should impart their speeches to their intimate friends, the transcripts whereof were multiplied amongst others;" and perhaps to this practice may be ascribed the variations sometimes observable in different copies of the same speech.

† Delivered in the House of Commons June 3, 1628, while the Petition of Right, providing that no loan or tax might be levied but by consent of Parliament, was under discussion. The reluctant consent of the King was given to the Petition June 7, 1628.

be not reformation, we need no foes abroad. Time itself will ruin us. . . .

Fifthly, Mr Speaker, I fear I have been too long in these particulars that are past, and am unwilling to offend you; therefore in the rest I shall be shorter, and as to that which concerns the impoverishing of the King, no other arguments will I use than such as all men grant.

The exchequer, you know, is empty, and the reputation thereof gone; the ancient lands are sold; the jewels pawned; the plate engaged;* the debts still great; almost all charges, both ordinary and extraordinary, borne up by projects! What poverty can be greater? What necessity so great? What perfect English heart is not almost dissolved into sorrow for this truth?

Sixthly, For the oppression of the subject, which, as I remember, is the next particular I proposed, it needs no demonstration. The whole kingdom is a proof; and for the exhausting of our treasures, that very oppression speaks it. What waste of our provisions, what consumption of our ships, what destruction of our men there hath been. Witness that expedition to Algiers† —witness that with Mansfeldt—witness that to Cadiz—witness the next—witness that to Rhé —witness the last (I pray God we may never have more such witnesses)—witness, likewise, the Palatinate—witness Denmark—witness the Turks—witness the Dunkirkers—witness all! What losses we have sustained! How we are impaired in munitions, in ships, in men!

It is beyond contradiction that we were never so much weakened, nor ever had less hope how to be restored.

These, Mr Speaker, are our dangers; these are they who do threaten us, and these are, like the Trojan horse, brought in cunningly to surprise us. In these do lurk the strongest of our enemies, ready to issue on us; and if we do not speedily expel them, these are the signs, these are the invitations to others! These will so prepare their entrance that we shall have no means left of refuge or defence. If we have these enemies at home, how can we strive with those that are abroad? If we be free from these, no other can impeach us. Our ancient English virtue (like the old Spartan valour), cleared from these disorders—our being in sincerity of religion and once made friends with Heaven; having maturity of councils, sufficiency of generals, incorruption of officers, opulency in the King, liberty in the people, repletion in treasure, plenty of provisions, reparation of ships, preservation of men—our ancient English virtue, I say, thus rectified, will secure us; and unless there be a speedy reformation in these, I know not what hopes or expectations we can have.

These are the things, sir, I shall desire to have taken into consideration; that as we are the great council of the kingdom, and have the apprehension of these dangers, we may truly represent them unto the King, which I conceive we are bound to do by a triple obligation—of duty to God, of duty to his Majesty, and of duty to our country.

And, therefore, I wish it may so stand with the wisdom and judgment of the House, that these things may be drawn into the body of a remonstrance, and in all humility expressed, with a prayer to his Majesty, that for the safety of himself, for the safety of the kingdom, and for the safety of religion, he will be pleased to give us time to make perfect inquisition thereof, or to take them into his own wisdom, and there give them such timely reformation as the necessity and justice of the case doth import.

And thus, sir, with a large affection and loyalty to his Majesty, and with a firm duty and service to my country, I have suddenly (and it may be with some disorder) expressed the weak apprehensions I have, wherein, if I have erred, I humbly crave your pardon, and so submit myself to the censure of the House.

THOMAS WENTWORTH,

EARL OF STRAFFORD.

1593-1641.

WHEN IMPEACHED FOR HIGH TREASON BEFORE THE HOUSE OF LORDS, APRIL 13, 1641.‡

My Lords,—This day I stand before you, charged with high treason. The burden of the charge is heavy, yet far the more so because it hath borrowed the authority of the House of

* In allusion to the crown jewels and plate which Buckingham had taken to Holland, and pawned for £300,000.

† "Buckingham, some years before, had sent out an expedition for the capture of Algiers. It totally failed, and so incensed the Algerines that the commerce of England suffered tenfold loss in consequence; thirty-five ships, engaged in the Mediterranean trade, having been captured within a few months, and their crews sold for slaves."—*Goodrich.*

‡ Macaulay thus gives the character of Wentworth —"He was the first Englishman to whom a peerage was a sacrament of infamy, a baptism into the communion of corruption. As he was the first of the hateful list, so was he also by far the greatest; eloquent, sagacious, adventurous, intrepid, ready of invention, immutable of purpose; in every talent which exalts or destroys nations, pre-eminent—the lost archangel, the Satan of the apostasy."

Commons. If they were not interested, I might expect a no less easy, than I do a safe issue. But let neither my weakness plead my innocence, nor their power my guilt. If your Lordships will conceive of my defences as they are in themselves, without reference to either party—and I shall endeavour so to present them—I hope to go hence as clearly justified by you, as I now am in the testimony of a good conscience by myself.

My Lords, I have all along, during this charge, watched to see that poisoned arrow of treason, which some men would fain have feathered in my heart; but, in truth, it hath not been in my quickness to discover any such evil yet within my breast, though now, perhaps, by sinister information, sticking to my clothes.

They tell me of a two-fold treason—one against the Statute, another by the common law; this direct, that consecutive; this individual, that accumulative; this in itself, that by way of construction.

As to this charge of treason, I must and do acknowledge that if I had the least suspicion of my own guilt, I would save your Lordships the pains. I would cast the first stone. I would pass the first sentence of condemnation against myself. And whether it be so or not, I now refer to your Lordships' judgment and deliberation. You, and you only, under the care and protection of my gracious master, are my judges. I shall ever celebrate the providence and wisdom of your noble ancestors, who have put the keys of life and death, so far as concerns you and your posterity, into your own hands. None but your ownselves, my Lords, know the rate of your noble blood; none but yourselves must hold the balance in disposing of the same.* . . .

If that one article had been proved against me, it contained more weighty matter than all the charges besides. It would not only have been treason, but villainy, to have betrayed the trust of his Majesty's army. But, as the managers have been sparing, by reason of the times, as to insisting on that article, I have resolved to keep the same method, and not utter the least expression which might disturb the happy agreement intended between the two kingdoms. I only admire how I, being an incendiary against the Scots in the twenty-third article, am become a confederate with them in the twenty-eighth article! How could I be charged for betraying Newcastle, and also for fighting with the Scots at Newburne, since fighting against them was no possible means of betraying the town into their hands, but rather to hinder their passage thither! I never advised war any further than, in my poor judgment, it concerned the very life of the King's authority, and the safety and honour of his kingdom. Nor did I ever see that any advantage could be made by a war in Scotland, where nothing could be gained but hard blows. For my part, I honour that nation, but I wish they may ever be under their own climate. I have no desire that they should be too well acquainted with the better soil of England.

My Lords, you see what has been alleged for this constructive, or rather destructive, treason. For my part, I have not the judgment to conceive that such treason is agreeable to the fundamental grounds either of reason or of law. Not of reason, for how can that be treason in the lump or mass, which is not so in any of its parts? or how can that make a thing treasonable which is not so in itself? Not of law, since neither statute, common law, nor practice hath, from the beginning of the government, ever mentioned such a thing.

It is hard, my Lords, to be questioned upon a law which cannot be shown! Where hath this fire lain hid for so many hundred years, without smoke to discover it, till it thus bursts forth to consume me and my children? My Lords, do we not live under laws? and must we be punished by laws before they are made? Far better were it to live by no laws at all, but to be governed by those characters of virtue and discretion which Nature hath stamped upon us, than to put this necessity of divination upon a man, and to accuse him of a breach of law before it is a law at all! If a waterman upon the Thames split his boat by grating upon an anchor, and the same have no buoy appended to it, the owner of the anchor is to pay the loss; but if a buoy be set there, every man passeth upon his own peril. Now, where is the mark, where is the token set upon the crime to declare it to be high treason?

My Lords, be pleased to give that regard to the peerage of England as never to expose yourselves to such moot points, such constructive interpretations of law. If there must be a trial of wits, let the subject matter be something else than the lives and honour of peers! It will be wisdom for yourselves and your posterity to cast into the fire those bloody and mysterious volumes of constructive and arbitrary treason, as the primitive Christians did their books of curious arts, and betake yourselves to the plain letter of the law and statute, which telleth what is, and what is not, treason, without being ambitious to be more learned in the art of killing than our forefathers. These gentlemen tell us that they speak in defence of the Commonwealth against my arbitrary laws. Give me leave to say I speak

---

* "Strafford had no chance of acquittal except by inducing the Lords, from a regard to their dignity and safety, to rise above the influence of the Commons as his prosecutors, and of the populace, who surrounded Westminster Hall by thousands, demanding his condemnation. In this view, his exordium has admirable dexterity and force. He reverts to the same topic in his peroration, assuring them, with the deepest earnestness and solemnity (and, as the event showed, with perfect truth), that if they gave him up, they must expect to perish with him in the general ruin of the peerage."—*Goodrich.*

in defence of the Commonwealth against their arbitrary treason!

It is now full two hundred and forty years since any man was touched for this alleged crime to this height before myself. Let us not awaken those sleeping lions to our destruction, by taking up a few musty records that have lain by the walls for so many ages, forgotten or neglected.

My Lords, what is my present misfortune may be for ever yours! It is not the smallest part of my grief that not the crime of treason, but my other sins, which are exceeding many, have brought me to this bar; and, except your Lordships' wisdom provide against it, the shedding of my blood may make way for the tracing out of yours. You, your estates, your posterity, lie at the stake!

For my poor self, if it were not for your Lordships' interest, and the interest of a saint in heaven, who hath left me here two pledges on earth, I should never take the pains to keep up this ruinous cottage of mine. It is loaded with such infirmities that, in truth, I have no great pleasure to carry it about with me any longer. Nor could I ever leave it at a fitter time than this, when I hope that the better part of the world would perhaps think that by my misfortunes I had given a testimony of my integrity to my God, my King, and my country. I thank God I count not the afflictions of the present life to be compared to that glory which is to be revealed in the time to come!

My Lords! my Lords! my Lords! something more I had intended to say, but my voice and my spirit fail me. Only I do, in all humility and submission, cast myself down at your Lordships' feet, and desire that I may be a beacon to keep you from shipwreck. Do not put such rocks in your own way, which no prudence, no circumspection, can eschew or satisfy, but by your utter ruin!

And so, my Lords, even so, with all tranquillity of mind, I submit myself to your decision. And whether your judgment in my case—I wish it were not the case of you all—be for life or for death, it shall be righteous in my eyes, and shall be received with a *Te Deum laudamus*, we give God the praise.

OLIVER CROMWELL.

1599-1658.

STATE OF THE NATION.*

GENTLEMEN,—When I came hither, I did think that a duty was incumbent upon me a little to pity myself; because, this being a very extraordinary occasion, I thought I had very many things to say unto you, and was somewhat burdened and straitened thereby. But truly now, seeing *you* in such a condition as you are, I think I must turn off my pity in this, as I hope I shall in everything else, and consider *you* as certainly not being able long to bear that condition and heat that you are now in. . . . So far as possible, on this large subject, let us be brief; not studying the art of rhetoricians. Rhetoricians, whom I do not pretend to much concern with; neither with them, nor with what they use to deal in—words!

Truly *our* business is to speak things! The dispensations of God that are upon us do require it; and that subject upon which we shall make our discourse is somewhat of very great interest and concernment, both for the glory of God, and with reference to His interest in the world. I mean His peculiar, His most peculiar interest, His Church, the communion of the faithful followers of Christ;—and that will not leave any of us to exclude His general interest, which is the concernment of the living people, not as Christians, but as human creatures, within these three nations, and all the dependencies thereupon. I have told you I should speak to *things;* things that concern these interests: The glory of God, and His peculiar interest in the world—which latter is more extensive, I say more extensive, than the people of all these three nations with the appurtenances, or the countries and places, belonging unto them.

The first thing, therefore, that I shall speak to is *that* that is the first lesson of nature: being and preservation. As to that of being, I do think I do not ill style it the *first* consideration which nature teacheth the sons of Adam; and then I think we shall enter into a field large enough when we come to consider that of well-

---

* "No royal speech like this was ever delivered elsewhere in the world! It is—with all its prudence, and it is very prudent, sagacious, courteous, right royal in spirit—perhaps the most artless, transparent piece of public speaking this editor has ever studied. Rude, massive, genuine; like a block of unbeaten gold. A speech not so fit for Drury Lane, as for Valhalla, and the Sanhedrim of the gods. The man himself, and the England he presided over, there and then, are to a singular degree visible in it; open to our eyes, to our sympathies. He who would see Oliver, will find more of him here than in most of the history books yet written about him."—*Carlyle.*

being. But if being itself be not first well laid, I think the other will hardly follow.

Now in order to this, to the being and subsistence of these nations with all their dependencies, the conservation of that, namely, of our national being, is first to be viewed with respect to those who seek to undo it, and so make it *not to be;* and then very naturally we shall come to the consideration of what will make it *be*, of what will *keep* its being and subsistence.

Now that which plainly seeks the destruction of the being of these nations is, out of doubt, the endeavour and design of all the common enemies of them. I think, truly, it will not be hard to find out who those enemies are, nor what hath made them so. I think, they are all the wicked men in the world, whether abroad or at home, that are the enemies to the very being of these nations; and this upon a common account, from the very enmity that is in them to all such things. Whatsoever could serve the glory of God and the interest of His people, which they see to be more eminently, yea, more eminently patronised and professed in this nation (we will not speak it with vanity) than in all the nations in the world: *this* is the common ground of the common enmity entertained against the prosperity of our nation, against the very being of it. But we will not, I think, take up our time contemplating who these enemies are, and what they are, in the general notion; we will labour to *specificate* our enemies, to know what persons and bodies of persons they practically are that seek the very destruction and being of these three nations.

And truly I would not have laid such a foundation but to the end I might very particularly communicate with you about that same matter. For which above others, I think, you are called hither at this time: that I might particularly communicate with you about the many dangers these nations stand in from enemies abroad and at home, and advise with you about the remedies, and means to obviate these dangers—dangers which, say I, and I shall leave it to you whether you will join with me or no, strike at the very being and vital interest of these nations. And therefore, coming to particulars, I will shortly represent to you the estate of your affairs in that respect: in respect namely of the enemies you are engaged with; and how you come to be engaged with those enemies, and how they come to be, *as* heartily, I believe, engaged against you.

Why, truly, your great enemy is the Spaniard. He is a natural enemy. He is naturally so; he is naturally so throughout, by reason of that enmity that is in him against whatsoever is of God. Whatsoever is of God which is in *you*, or which may be in you; contrary to that which *his* blindness and darkness, led on by superstition, and the implicitness of his faith in submitting to the see of Rome, actuate him unto. With this king and state, I say, you are at present in hostility. We put you into this hostility. You will give us leave to tell you how. For we are ready to excuse this and most of our actions, and to justify them too, as well as to excuse them, upon the ground of necessity. And the ground of necessity, for justifying of men's actions, is above all considerations of instituted law; and if this or any other state should go about—as I know they never will—to make laws against events, against what *may* happen, then I think it is obvious to any man, they will be making laws against Providence; events, and issues of things, being from God alone, to whom all issues belong.

The Spaniard is your enemy; and your enemy, as I tell you, naturally, by that antipathy which is in him, and also providentially, and this in divers respects. You could not get an honest or honourable peace from him; it was sought by the Long Parliament; it was not attained. It could not be attained with honour and honesty. I say, it could not be attained with honour and honesty. And truly when I say that, I do but say, He is naturally throughout *an enemy;* an enmity is put into him by God. "I will put an enmity between thy seed and her seed" (Gen. iii. 15); which goes but for little among statesmen, but is more considerable than all things. And he that considers not such natural enmity, the *providential* enmity, as well as the *accidental*, I think he is not well acquainted with Scripture and the things of God. And the Spaniard is not only our enemy accidentally, but he is providentially so; God having in His wisdom disposed it so to be, when we made a breach with the Spanish nation long ago.

No sooner did this nation form what is called (unworthily) the reformed religion after the death of Queen Mary, by the Queen Elizabeth of famous memory—we need not be ashamed to call her so!—but the Spaniard's design became, by all unworthy, unnatural means, to destroy that person, and to seek the ruin and destruction of these kingdoms. For me to instance in particulars upon that account, were to trouble you at a very unseasonable time. There is a declaration extant which very fully hath in it the origin of the Spaniard venting himself upon this nation; and a series of it from those very beginnings to this present day. But his enmity was partly upon that general account which all are agreed about. The French, all the Protestants in Germany, all have agreed that his design was the empire of the whole Christian world, if not more; and upon *that* ground he looks, and hath looked, at this nation as his greatest obstacle. And as to what his attempts have been for that end, I refer you to that declaration, and to the observations of men who read history. It would not be difficult to call to mind the several assassinations designed upon that lady, that great queen: the attempts upon Ireland, the Spaniards' invading of it; their

designs of the same nature upon *this* nation,—public designs, private designs, all manner of designs to accomplish this great and general end. Truly King James made a peace; but whether this nation, and the interest of all Protestant Christians, suffered not more by that peace than ever by Spain's hostility, I refer to your consideration!

Thus a state which you can neither have peace with nor reason from—that is the state with which you have enmity at this time, and against which you are engaged. And give me leave to say this unto you, because it is truth, and most men know it, that the Long Parliament did endeavour, but could not obtain satisfaction from the Spaniard all the time they sat: for their messenger was murdered: and when they asked satisfaction for the blood of your poor people unjustly shed in the West Indies, and for the wrongs done elsewhere; when they asked liberty of conscience for your people who traded thither—satisfaction in none of these things would be given, but was denied. I say they denied satisfaction either for your messenger that was murdered, or for the blood that was shed, or the damages that were done in the West Indies. No satisfaction at all; nor any reason offered *why* there should not be liberty of conscience given to your people that traded thither. Whose trade was very considerable there, and drew many of your people thither; and begot an apprehension in *us* as to their treatment there; whether in *you* or no, let God judge between you and Himself. I judge not: but all of us know that the people who went thither to manage the trade there were imprisoned. We desired but such a liberty as that they might keep their Bibles in their pockets, to exercise their liberty of religion for themselves, and not be under restraint. But there is not liberty of conscience to be had from the Spaniard; neither is there satisfaction for injuries, nor for blood. When these two things were desired, the ambassador told us, "It was to ask his master's two eyes;" to ask both his eyes, asking these things of him!

Now if this be so, why truly then here is some little foundation laid to justify the war that has been entered upon with the Spaniard! And not only so: but the plain truth of it is, Make any peace with any state that is popish and subjected to the determination of Rome and of the Pope himself,—you are bound, and they are loose. It is the pleasure of the Pope at any time to tell you that though the man is murdered, yet his murderer has got into the sanctuary! And equally true is it, and hath been found by common and constant experience, that peace is but to be kept so long as the Pope saith Amen to it. We have not now to do with any popish state except France: and it is certain that *they* do not think themselves under such a tie to the Pope; but think themselves at liberty to perform honesties with nations in agreement with them, and protest against the obligation of such a thing as that of breaking your word at the Pope's bidding. *They* are able to give us an explicit answer to anything reasonably demanded of them: and there is no other popish state we can speak of, save this only, but will break their promise or keep it as they please, upon these grounds: being under the lash of the Pope, to be by him determined, and made to decide.

In the time when Philip II. was married to Queen Mary, and since that time, through Spanish power and instigation, twenty thousand Protestants were murdered in Ireland. We thought, being denied just things, we thought it our duty to get that by the sword which was not to be had otherwise. And this hath been the spirit of Englishmen; and if so, certainly it is, and ought to be, the spirit of men that have *higher* spirits! With that state you are engaged. And it is a great and powerful state; though I may say also, that with all other Christian states you are at peace. All these your other engagements were upon you before this Government was undertaken: war with France, Denmark, nay, upon the matter, war, or as good as war, with Spain itself. I could instance how it was said in the Long Parliament time, "We will have a war in the Indies, though we fight them not at home." I say we are at peace with all other nations, and have only a war with Spain. I shall say somewhat further to you, which will let you see our clearness as to that, by-and-by.

Having thus said we are engaged with Spain, that is the root of the matter; that is the party that brings *all* your enemies before you. It doth; for so it is now, that Spain hath espoused that interest which you have all along hitherto been conflicting with—Charles Stuart's interest. And I would but meet the gentleman upon a fair discourse who is willing that that person should come back again! but I dare not believe any in this room is. And I say it doth not detract at all from your cause, nor from your ability to make defence of it, that God by His providence hath so disposed that the King of Spain should espouse that person. And I say further, No man but might be very well satisfied that it is not for aversion to that person. And the "choosing out" (as was said to-day*) "a captain to lead us *back into Egypt*," what honest man has *not* an aversion to that? if there *be* such a place; I mean metaphorically and allegorically such a place. If there be, that is to say, a *returning* on the part of some to all those things we have been fighting against, and a destroying of all that good (as we had some hints to-day) which we have attained unto. I am sure my speech and defence of the Spanish war will signify very little if such grounds go not for good. Nay, I will say this to you, Not a man

* In Dr Owen's sermon, preached that day.

in England that is disposed to comply with Papists and Cavaliers, but to him my speech here is the greatest parable, the absurdest discourse. And in a word, we could wish they were all where Charles Stuart is, all who declare that they are of that spirit. I do, with all my heart; and I would help them with a boat to carry them over who are of that mind. Yea, and if you shall think it a duty to drive them over by arms, I will help in that also. . . .

You are engaged with such an enemy—a foreign enemy, who hath such allies among ourselves: this last said hath a little vehemency in it; but it is well worth your consideration.

Though I seem to be all this while upon the justice of the business, yet my desire is to let you see the dangers and grand crisis this nation stands in thereby. All the honest interests, yea, all interests of the Protestants, in Germany, Denmark, Helvetia, and the Cantons, and all the interests in Christendom, are the same as yours. If you succeed, if you succeed well and act well, and be convinced what is God's interest, and prosecute it, you will find that you act for a very great many who are God's own. Therefore I say that your danger is from the common enemy abroad, who is the head of the papal interest, the head of the Antichristian interest, who is so described in Scripture, so forespoken of, and so fully, under that characteral name of Antichrist given him by the Apostle in the Epistle to the Thessalonians, and likewise so expressed in the Revelations, which are sure and plain things. Except you will deny the truth of the Scriptures, you must needs see that that state is so described in Scripture to be papal and Antichristian. I say, with this enemy, and upon this acccunt, you have the quarrel with the Spaniard.

And truly he hath an interest in your bowels; he hath so. The Papists in England, they have been accounted, ever since I was born, Spaniolised. There is not a man among us can hold up his face against that. They never regarded France; they never regarded any other Papist state where a hostile interest was, but Spain only. Spain was their patron. Their patron all along, in England, in Ireland, and Scotland; no man can doubt of it. Therefore I must needs say, this Spanish interest is also, in regard to your home affairs, a great source of your danger. It is, and it evidently is, and will be more so, upon that account that I told you of. He hath espoused Charles Stuart, with whom he is fully in agreement; for whom he hath raised seven or eight thousand men, and has them now quartered at Bruges. to which number Don John of Austria has promised that as soon as the campaign is ended, which it is conceived will be in about five or six weeks, he shall have four or five thousand added. And the Duke of Neuburg, who is a popish prince, hath promised good assistance, according to his power, and other popish states the like. In this condition you are with that state of Spain, and in this condition through unavoidable necessity; because your enemy was *naturally* an enemy, and is providentially too become so.

And now, further, as there is a complication of these interests abroad, so there is a complication of them here. Can we think that Papists and Cavaliers shake not hands in England? It is unworthy, unchristian, un-English-like, say you. Yes; but it doth serve to let you see, and for that end I tell it you that you may see, your danger, and the source thereof. Nay, it is only thus, in this condition of hostility, that we stand towards Spain, and towards all the interest which would make void and frustrate everything that has been doing for you; namely, towards the popish interest, Papists, and Cavaliers; but it is also . . . That is to say, your danger is *so great*, if you will be sensible of it, by reason of persons who pretend *other* things. Pretend, I say; yea, who, though perhaps they *do* not all suit in their hearts with the said popish interest, yet every man knows, and must know, that discontented parties are among us somewhere. They must expect backing and support somewhere. They must end in the interest of the Cavalier at the long-run. That must be their support. I could have reckoned this in another head, but I give you an account of things as they arise to me. Because I desire to clear them to you. Not discoursively, in the oratoric way; but to let you see the matter of fact, to let you see how the state of you affairs stands.

Certain it is, there was, not long since, an endeavour to make an insurrection in England. It was going on for some time before it broke out. It was so before the last Parliament sat. Nay, it was so not only from the time of the undertaking of this Government, but the spirit and principle of it did work in the Long-Parliament time. From that time to this hath there been nothing but enterprising and designing against you. And this is no strange or new thing to tell you; because it is true and certain that the Papists, the Priests, and Jesuits, have a great influence upon the Cavalier party; they and the Cavaliers prevail upon the discontented spirits of the nation, who are not all so apt to see where the dangers lie, nor to what the management of affairs tends. Those Papists and Cavaliers do foment all things that tend to *dis*service; to propagate discontentments upon the minds of men. And if we could instance, in particulars, those that have manifested this, we could tell you how priests and Jesuits have insinuated themselves into men's society; pretending the same things that *they* pretended; whose ends, these Jesuits' ends, have, out of doubt, been what I have told you.

We had that insurrection. It was intended first to the assassination of my person, which I would not remember as anything at all consider

able to myself or to you; for they would have had to cut throats beyond human calculation before they could have been able to effect their design. But you know it very well, this of the assassination; it is no fable. Persons were arraigned for it before the Parliament sat, and tried, and upon proof condemned, for their designs to cut the throat of myself and three or four more, whom they had singled out as being, a little beyond ordinary, industrious to preserve the peace of the nation, and did think to make a very good issue in that way, to the accomplishment of their designs. I say this was made good upon the trial. Before the Parliament sat, all the time the Parliament sat, they were about it. We did hint these things to the Parliament people by several persons, who acquainted them therewith. But what fame we lay under I know not. It was conceived, it seems, we had things which rather intended to persuade agreement and consent, and bring money out of the people's purses, or I know not what; in short, nothing was believed, though there was a series of things distinctly and plainly communicated to many Members.

The Parliament rose about the middle of January. By the 12th of March after the people were in arms. But "they were a company of mean fellows," alas! "not a lord, nor a gentleman, nor a man of fortune, nor a this nor that, among them; but it was a poor, headstrong people, a company of rash fellows who were at the undertaking of this," and that was all. And by such things have men once well affected lost their consciences and honours, complying, coming to agreement with malignants, upon such notions as these. Give me leave to tell you, we know it; we are able to prove it. And I refer you to that declaration which was for guarding against Cavaliers (as I did before to that other declaration which set down the grounds of our war with Spain), whether these things were true or no? If men will not believe, we are satisfied, we do our duty. If we let you know things and the ground of them, it is satisfaction enough to *us*; but to see how men can reason themselves out of their honours and consciences in their compliance with those sort of people,—which truly, I must needs say, some men had compliance with, who I thought never *would* for all the world: I must tell you so.

These men rise in March. And that it was a general design, I think all the world must know and acknowledge. For it is as evident as the day that the king sent Sir Joseph Wagstaff and another, the Earl of Rochester, to the north. And that it was general, we had not by suspicion or imagination; but we know individuals. We are able to make appear, that persons who carried themselves the most demurely and fairly of any men in England were engaged in this business. And he that gave us our intelligence lost his life in Neuburg country; I think I may now speak of that, because he is dead; but he did discover, from time to time, a full intelligence of these things. Therefore, how men of wicked spirits may traduce us in that matter; or, notwithstanding all that hath been done, may still continue their compliances with the malignants· I leave it. I think England cannot be safe unless malignants be carried far away.

There was never any design on foot but we could hear it out of the tower. He who commanded there would give us account that within a fortnight, or such a thing, there would be some stirrings, for a great concourse of people were coming to them, and they had very great elevations of spirit; and not only there, but in all the counties of England. We have had informations that they were upon designs all over England (besides some particular places which came to our particular assurance), by knowledge we had from persons in the several counties of England.

And if this *be* so, then, as long as commotions can be held on foot, you are in danger by your war with Spain, with whom all the papal interest is joined. This Pope is a person all the world knows to be a person of zeal for his religion—wherein, perhaps, he may shame *us*—and a man of contrivance, and wisdom, and policy, and his designs are known to be, all over, nothing but an endeavour to unite all the popish interests in all the Christian world, against this nation above any, and against all the Protestant interest in the world. If this be so, and if you will take a measure of these things, if we must still hold the esteem that we have had for Spaniards, and be ready to shake hands with them and the Cavaliers, what doth this differ from the Bishop of Canterbury striving to reconcile matters of religion; if this temper be upon us to unite with these popish men in civil things. Give me leave to say and speak what I know; if this be men's mind, I tell you plainly, I hope I need not; but I wish all the Cavaliers in England, and all the Papists, heard me declare it, and many besides yourselves have heard me. There are a company of poor men that are ready to spend their blood against such compliance, and I am persuaded of the same thing in you.

If this be our condition, with respect had to this, truly let us go a little further. For I would lay open the danger wherein I think in my conscience we stand; and if God give not your hearts to see and discern what is obvious, we shall sink, and the house will fall about our ears, upon even what are called "such sordid attempts" as these same. Truly there are a great many people in this nation who "would not reckon up every pitiful thing," perhaps like the nibbling of a mouse at one's heel, but only "considerable dangers." I will tell you plainly what to me seems dangerous; it is not a time for compliments nor rhetorical speeches. I have

none, truly; but to tell you how we *find* things.

There is a generation of men in this nation who cry up nothing but righteousness and justice and liberty, and these are diversified into several sects and sorts of men; and though they may be contemptible, in respect they are many, and so not like to make a solid vow to do you mischief, yet they are apt to agree *in aliquo tertio*. They are known (yea, well enough) to shake hands with—I should be loath to say with Cavaliers—but with all the scum and dirt of this nation, to put you to trouble. And, when I come to speak of the *remedies*, I shall tell you what are the most apt and proper remedies in these respects. I speak now of the very time when there was an insurrection at Salisbury, your Wagstaffs and Penruddocks openly in arms. . . . I doubt whether it be believed there ever was any rising in North Wales at the same time; at Shrewsbury; at Rufford Abbey, where were about five hundred horse; or at Marston Moor; or in Northumberland, and the other places, where all these insurrections were at that very time. . . . There was a party which was very proper to come between the Papists and Cavaliers; and that *Levelling* party hath some accession lately, which goes under a *finer* name or notion. I think they would now be called "Commonwealth's-men," who perhaps have right to it little enough. And it is strange that men of fortune and great estates should join with such a people. But if the *fact* be so, there will need no stretch of wit to make it evident, it being so by demonstration.

I say, this people at that very time, they were pretty numerous; and, do not despise them, at the time when the Cavaliers were risen, this very party had prepared a declaration against all the things that had been transacted by us, and called them I know not what names—"tyranny," "oppression," things "against the liberty of the subject," and cried out for "justice," and "righteousness," and "liberty;" and what was all this business for, but to join the Cavaliers to carry on that design? And these are things, not words. That declaration we got, and the penner of it we got; and we have got intelligence also how the business was laid and contrived, which was hatched in the time of the sitting of that Parliament. I do not accuse anybody, but that was the *time* of it; an unhappy time. And a plausible petition had been penned, which must come to me, forsooth, "To consider of these things, and to give redress and remedies." And this was so.

Now, indeed, I must tell you plainly, we suspected a great deal of violence then, and we did hunt it out. I will not tell you these are high things; but at that time when the Cavaliers were to rise, a party was to seize upon General Monk in Scotland, and to commit him to Edinburgh Castle, upon this pretence of "liberty;" and when they had seized him, and clapped him by the heels—him and some other true and faithful officers—they had resolved a number at the same time should march away for London, leaving a party behind them, to have their throats cut by the Scots. Though I will not say they would have purposely brought it to this pass, yet it cannot be thought but that a considerable part of the army would have followed them hither at the heels. . . . And not only thus, but this same spirit and principle designed some little fiddling things upon some of your officers, to an assassination; and an officer was engaged, who was upon the guard, to seize me in my bed. This was true. And other foolish designs there were, as, to get into a room, to get gunpowder laid in it, and to blow up the room where I lay. And this, we can tell you, is *true*. These are persons not worthy naming, but the things are *true*. And such is the state we have stood in, and had to conflict with, since the last Parliament. And upon this account, and in this combination, it is that I say to you, that the ringleaders to all this are none but your old enemies, the Papists and Cavaliers. We have some of them in prison for these things.

Now we would be loath to tell you of notions mere seraphical. *These* are poor and low conceits. We have had very seraphical notions. We have had endeavours to deal between two interests; one some section of that Commonwealth interest, and another which was a notion of a Fifth-Monarchy interest. Which strange operation I do not recite, nor what condition it is in, as thinking it not worthy our trouble. But *de facto* it hath been so, that there have been endeavours, as there were endeavours to make a reconciliation between Herod and Pilate that Christ might be put to death, so there have been endeavours of reconciliation between the Fifth-Monarchy men and the Commonwealth men that there might be union in order to an end—no *end* can be so bad as *that* of Herod's was—but in order to end in blood and confusion. And, that you may know, to tell you candidly, I profess I do not believe of these two last—of Commonwealth men and Fifth-Monarchy men—but that they have stood at a distance, aloof from Charles Stuart. I think they did not participate. I would be so charitable, I would be, that they did not. But this I will tell you, that as for the others, *they* did not only set these things on work, but they sent a fellow, a wretched creature, an apostate from religion and all honesty,—they sent him to Madrid to advise with the King of Spain to land forces to invade the nation. Promising satisfaction that they would comply and concur with him to have both men and moneys, undertaking both to engage the fleet to mutiny, and also your army to gain a garrison on the coast; to raise a party, so that if the Spaniard would say where he would land, they would be ready to assist him. This person was sometimes a colonel in the army. He went

with letters to the Archduke Leopoldus and Don John. That was an "ambassador;" and gave promise of much moneys, and hath been soliciting and did obtain moneys, which he sent hither by bills of exchange: and God, by His providence, we being exceeding poor, directed that we lighted on some of them, and some of the moneys. Now if they be payable, let them be called for. If the House shall think fit to order any inspection into these things, they may have it.

We think it our duty to tell you of these things, and we can make them good. Here is your danger; that is it! Here is a poor nation that hath wallowed in its blood, though, thanks be to God, we have had peace these four or five years; yet here is the condition we stand in. And I think I should be false to you if I did not give you this true representation of it.

I am to tell you, by the way, a word to justify a thing which I hear is much spoken of. When we knew all these designs before mentioned, when we found that the Cavaliers would not be quiet. . . . No quiet; "there is no peace to the wicked," saith the Scripture (Isaiah lvii.): "They are like the troubled sea, which cannot rest; whose waters throw up mire and dirt." They cannot rest; they have no peace with God in Jesus Christ to the remission of sins. They do not know what belongs to that; therefore they know not how to be at rest; therefore they can no more cease from their actions than they can cease to live, nor so easily neither. . . . Truly when that insurrection was, and we saw it in all the roots and grounds of it, we did find out a little poor invention, which I hear has been much regretted. I say there was a little thing invented, which was the erecting of your major-generals. To have a little inspection upon the people thus divided, thus discontented, thus dissatisfied, split into divers interests, and the workings of the popish party. Workings of the Lord Taffe and others, the most consisting of natural Irish rebels, and all those men you have fought against in Ireland, and have expulsed from thence, as having had a hand in that bloody massacre; of him and of those that were under his power, who were now to have joined in this excellent business of insurrection.

And upon such a rising as that was; truly I think if ever anything were justifiable as to necessity, and honest in every respect, this was. And I could as soon venture my life with it as with anything I ever undertook. We did find—I mean myself and the Council did—that, if there were need to have greater forces to carry on this work, it was a most righteous thing to put the charge upon that party which was the cause of it. And if there be any man that hath a face averse to this, I dare pronounce him to be a man against the interest of England. Upon this account, upon this ground of necessity, when we saw what game they were upon, and knew individual persons, and of the greatest rank, not a few, engaged in this business (I knew one man that laid down his life for it), and had it by intercepted letters made as clear as the day; we did think it our duty to make that class of persons who, as evidently as anything in the world, were in the combination of the insurrectionists, bear their share of the charge. Bear their share, one with another, for the raising of the forces, which were so necessary to defend us against those designs. And truly if any man be angry at it, I am plain, and shall use an homely expression: "Let him turn the buckle of his girdle behind him." If this were to be done again I would do it.

How the major-generals have behaved themselves in that work! I hope they are men, as to their persons, of known integrity and fidelity; and men who have freely adventured their blood and lives for that good cause, if it still be thought such; and it was well stated this morning, against all the new humours and fancies of men. . . . And truly England doth yet receive one day more of lengthening out its tranquillity by that same service of theirs. . . .

Well, your danger is as you have seen. And truly I am sorry it is so great. But I wish it to cause no despondency, as truly I think it will not, for we are Englishmen; that is one good fact. And if God give a nation the property of valour and courage, it is honour and a mercy from Him. And much more than English. Because you all, I hope, are Christian men, who know Jesus Christ, and know that cause which hath been mentioned to you this day.

Having declared to you my sense and knowledge—pardon me if I say so, my knowledge—of the condition of these poor nations, for it hath an influence upon them all; it concerneth them all very palpably. I should be to blame if I did not a little offer to you the remedies. I would comprehend them under two considerations. They are both somewhat general. The one is, the considering all things that may be done, and ought to be done, in order to security—that is one. And truly the other is a common head, a general, nay, a universal consideration. The other is, doing all things that ought to be done in order to reformation, and with that I will close my discourse. All that hath hitherto been hinted at was but to give you a sense of the danger, which truly is most material and significant, for which principally you are called hither to advise of the remedies. I do put them, the remedies, into this twofold method, not but that I think they are scarcely distinct. I do believe, truly, upon serious and deliberate consideration, that a true reformation, as it may, and will through God's acceptance, and by the endeavours of His poor servants, be—that that, I say, will be pleasing in His sight, and will prove not only what shall avert the present danger, but be a worthy return for all the blessings and mercies which you have received. So, in my conscience,

if I were put to show it, this hour, where the security of these nations will lie—forces, arms, watchings, posts, strength; your being and freedom; be as politic and diligent, and as vigilant as you can be—I would say in my conscience, and as before Almighty God I speak it: I think your reformation, if it be honest, and thorough, and just, *it* will be your best security!

First, however, with regard to security outwardly considered. We will speak a little distinctly to that. You see where your war is. It is with the Spaniard. You have peace with all other nations, or the most of them—Swede, Dane, Dutch. At present, I say, it is well; it is at present so. And so likewise with the Portugal, with France—the Mediterranean Sea. Both these states, both Christian and profane, the Mohammedan—you have peace with them all. Only with Spain you have a difference; you have a war. I pray consider it. Do I come to tell you that I would *tie* you to this war? No. According as you shall find your spirits and reasons grounded on what hath been said, so let you and me join in the prosecution of that war, according as we are satisfied, and as the cause shall appear to our consciences in the sight of the Lord. But if you *can* come to prosecute it, prosecute it vigorously, or don't do it at all!

Truly I shall speak a very great word—one may ask a very great question: "*Unde*, whence shall the means of it come?" Our nation is overwhelmed in debts! Nevertheless I think it my duty to deal plainly; I shall speak what even nature teacheth us. If we engage in a business—a recoiling man may *haply* recover of his enemy; but the wisdom of a man surely will be in the keeping of his ground. Therefore that is what I advise you, that we join together to prosecute it *vigorously*. In the second place, I would advise you to deal effectually, even *because* there is such a "complication of interests" as some keep objecting. If you believe that there is such a complication of interests, why, then, in the name of God, that excites you the more to do it. Give me leave to tell you, I do not believe that in any war that ever was in former times, nor in any engagements that you have had with other enemies, this nation had more obligation upon it to look to itself—to forbear waste of time, precious time. Needlessly to mind things that are not essential; to be quibbling about words, and comparatively about things of no moment; and in the meantime—being in such a case as I suppose you know we are—to suffer ourselves to be wanting to a just defence against the common enemies abroad, or not to be thoroughly sensible of the distempers that are at home. . . . I know perhaps there are many considerations which may teach you, which may incline you, to keep your own hands tender from men of one religion with ourselves, and of an interest that is so spread in the nation. However, if they seek the eradication of the nation; if they be active as you have seen, and as it hath been made manifest so as not to be denied, to the carrying on of their designs; if England must be eradicated by persons complicated with the Spaniard; if this must be brought upon us through distempers and falseness of men among themselves, then the question is no more than this: Whether any consideration whatsoever shall lead us, for fear of eradicating distempers, to suffer all the honest interests of this nation to be eradicated? Therefore, speaking generally of any of their distempers, which are of all sorts—where a member cannot be cured, the rule is plain, *Ense rescindendum est immedicabile vulnus.* And I think it is of such an advantage that nothing ever could more properly be put in practice, since this or any nation first was.

As to those lesser distempers of people that pretend religion, yet which, from the whole consideration of religion, would fall under one of the heads of reformation, I had rather put these under this head; and I shall the less speak to it, because you have been so well spoken to already to-day elsewhere. I will tell you the truth. Our practice since the last Parliament hath been, to let all this nation see that whatever pretensions to religion would continue quiet, peaceable, they should enjoy conscience and liberty to themselves, and *not* to make religion a pretence for arms and blood. Truly we have suffered them, and that cheerfully, so to enjoy their own liberties. Whatsoever is contrary, and not peaceable, let the pretence be never so specious, if it tend to combination, to interests and factions, we shall not care, by the grace of God, *whom* we meet withal, though never so specious, if they be not quiet. And truly I am against all "liberty of conscience" repugnant to *this.* If men will profess—be they those under Baptism, be they those of the Independent judgment simply, or of the Presbyterian judgment—in the name of God, encourage them, countenance them, so long as they do plainly continue to be thankful to God, and to make use of the liberty given them to enjoy their own consciences. For, as it was said to-day, undoubtedly "*this* is the peculiar interest all this while contended for."

Men who believe in Jesus Christ—that is the form that gives being to true religion, namely, to faith in Christ, and walking in a profession answerable to that faith—men who believe the remission of sins through the blood of Christ, and free justification by the blood of Christ, who live upon the grace of God: those men who are certain they are so, they are members of Jesus Christ, and are to Him the apple of His eye. Whoever hath this faith, let his form be what it will, he walking peaceably, without prejudice to others under other forms; it is a debt due to God and Christ; and He will require it, if that Christian may not enjoy his liberty.

If a man of one form will be trampling upon the heels of another form; if an Independent, for example, will despise him who is under Baptism, and will revile him, and reproach and provoke him, I will not suffer it in him. If, on the other side, those of the Anabaptist judgment shall be censuring the godly ministers of the nation who profess under that of Independency; or if those that profess under Presbytery shall be reproaching or speaking evil of them, traducing and censuring of them—as I would not be willing to see the day when England shall be in the power of the Presbytery to impose upon the consciences of others that profess faith in Christ—so I will not endure any reproach to them. But God give us hearts and spirits to keep things *equal*. Which, truly I must profess to you, hath been my temper. I have had some boxes on the ear, and rebukes, on the one hand and on the other; some censuring me for Presbytery; others as an inletter to all the sects and heresies of the nation. I have borne my reproach; but I have, through God's mercy, not been unhappy in hindering on one religion to impose upon another. And truly I must needs say (I speak it experimentally), I have found it, I have, that those of the Presbyterian judgment . . . I speak it knowingly, as having received from very many counties—I have had petitions, and acknowledgments and professions, from whole counties; as from Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, and other counties. Acknowledgment that they, the Presbyterians there, do but desire they may have liberty and protection in the worshipping of God according to their own judgments; for the purging of their congregations, and the labouring to attain more purity of faith and repentance; and that, in their outward profession, they will not strain themselves beyond their own line. I have had those petitions; I have them to show. And I confess I look at that as the blessedest thing which hath been since the adventuring upon this Government, or which these times produce. And I hope I gave them fair and honest answers. And if it shall be found to *be* the civil magistrate's real endeavour to keep all professing Christians in this relation to one another, not suffering any to say or do what will justly provoke the others, I think he that would have more liberty than this is not worthy of any.

This, therefore, I think verily, if it may be under consideration for reformation; I say, if it please God to give you and me hearts to keep *this* straight, it may be a great means in giving countenance to just ministers—in countenancing a just *maintenance* to them by tithes or otherwise. For my part, I should think I were very treacherous if I took away tithes, till I see the legislative power settle maintenance to ministers another way. But whoever they be that shall contend to destroy tithes, it doth as surely cut their the ministers' throats as it is a drift to take tithes away before another mode of maintenance, or way of preparation towards such, be had. Truly I think all such practices and proceedings should be discountenanced. I have heard it from as gracious a minister as any is in England; I have had it professed, that it would be a far greater satisfaction to them to have maintenance another way, if the State will provide it. . . . Therefore I think, for the keeping of the Church and people of God and professors in their several forms in this liberty—I think as it, this of tithes, or some other maintenance, hath been a thing that is the root of visible profession, the upholding of this—I think you will find a blessing in it, if God keep your hearts to keep things in this posture and balance, which is so honest and so necessary.

Truly, there might be some other things offered to you in point of reformation; a reformation of manners, to wit . . . But I had forgot one thing which I must remember. It is the Church's work, you know, in some measure; yet give me leave to ask, and I appeal unto your consciences, whether or no there hath not been an honest care taken for the ejecting of scandalous ministers, and for the bringing-in of them that have passed an approbation? I dare say, such an approbation as never passed in England before. And give me leave to say, it hath been with this difference from the old practice that neither Mr Parson nor doctor in the university hath been reckoned stamp enough by those that made these approbations; though, I can say too, they have a great esteem for learning, and look at grace as most useful when it falls unto men *with* rather than without that addition, and wish, with all their hearts, the flourishing of all those institutions of learning as much as any. I think there hath been a conscience exercised, both by myself and the ministers, towards them that have been approved. I may say, such a one as I truly believe was never known in England in regard to this matter. And I do verily believe that God hath for the ministry a very great seed in the youth now in the universities, who, instead of studying books, study their own hearts. I do believe, as God hath made a very great and flourishing seed to that purpose, so this ministry of England—I think, in my very conscience, that God will bless and favour it; and hath blessed it, to the gaining of very many souls. It was never so upon the thriving hand since England was, as at this day. Therefore, I say, in these things, in these arrangements made by us, which tend to the profession of the Gospel and public ministry, I think you will be so far from hindering, that you will further them. And I shall be willing to join with you.

I did hint to you my thoughts about the reformation of manners. And those abuses that are in this nation through disorder, are a thing which should be much in your hearts. It is that which, I am confident, is a description and char-

acter of the interest you have been engaged against, the Cavalier interest; the badge and character of countenancing profaneness, disorder, and wickedness in all places, and whatever is most of kin to these, and most agrees with what is popery, and with the profane nobility and gentry of this nation. In my conscience, it was a shame to be a Christian within these fifteen, sixteen, or seventeen years in this nation. Whether "in Cæsar's house" or elsewhere. It was a shame, it was a reproach to a man, and the badge of "Puritan" was put upon it. We would keep up nobility and gentry; and the way to keep them up is, not to suffer them to be patronisers or countenancers of debauchery and disorders. And you will hereby be as labourers in that work of keeping them up. And a man may tell as plainly as can be what becomes of us if we grow indifferent and lukewarm in repressing evil, under I know not what weak pretensions. If it lives in us, therefore, I say, if it be in the general heart of the nation, it is a thing I am confident our liberty and prosperity depend upon—reformation. Make it a shame to see men bold in sin and profaneness, and God will bless you. You will be a blessing to the nation, and by this will be more repairers of breaches than by anything in the world. Truly these things do respect the souls of men, and the spirits, which *are* the men. The mind is the man. If that be kept pure, a man signifies somewhat; if not, I would very fain see what difference there is betwixt him and a beast. He hath only some activity to do some more mischief.

There are some things which respect the estates of men; and there is one general grievance in the nation. It is the law. Not that the laws are a grievance; but there are laws that are; and the great grievance lies in the execution and administration. I think I may say it, I have as eminent judges in this land as have been had, as the nation has had, for these many years. Truly I could be particular, as to the executive part of it, as to the administration of the law; but that would trouble you. The truth of it is, there are wicked and abominable laws which it will be in your power to alter. To hang a man for six and eightpence, and I know not what; to hang for a trifle, and acquit murder, is in the ministration of the law, through the ill framing of it. I have known in my experience abominable murders acquitted. And to see men lose their lives for petty matters; this is a thing God will reckon for. And I wish it may not lie upon this nation a day longer than you have an opportunity to give a remedy; and I hope I shall cheerfully join with you in it. This hath been a great grief to many honest hearts and conscientious people; and I hope it is in all your hearts to rectify it.

I have little more to say to you, being very weary, and I know you are so too. Truly I did begin with what I thought was the means to carry on this war (if you will carry it on), that we might join together in that vigorously. And I did promise an answer to an objection: "But what will you prosecute it with?" The State is hugely in debt; I believe it comes to ——. The treasure of the State is run out. We shall not be an enemy to your inspection, but desire it; that you should inspect the treasury, and how moneys have been expended. And we are not afraid to look the nation in the face upon this score. And therefore we will say negatively, *first*, No man can say we have misemployed the treasures of this nation, and embezzled it to particular and private uses.

It may be we have not been, as the world terms it, so fortunate in all our successes, in the issues of all our attempts. Truly if we are of mind that God may not decide for us in these things, I think we shall be quarrelling with what God himself will answer for. And we hope we are able—it may be weakly, I doubt not—to give an answer to God, and to give an answer to every man's conscience in the sight of God, of the reason of things. But we shall tell you, it was part of that Arch-Fire, which hath been in this your time, wherein there were flames good store, fire enough; and it will be your wisdom and skill, and God's blessing upon you, to *quench* them both here and elsewhere. I say it again, our endeavoars—by those that have been appointed, by those that have been major-generals; I can repeat it with comfort,—they have been effectual for the preservation of your peace. It hath been more effectual towards the discountenancing of vice, and settling religion, than anything done these fifty years. I will abide by it, notwithstanding the envy and slander of foolish men. But I say there was a design—I confess I speak that to you with a little vehemency—but you had not peace two months together, nothing but plot after plot; I profess I believe it as much as ever I did anything in the world; and how instrumental *they*, these major-generals, have been to your peace and for your preservation, by such means, which we say was necessity. More instrumental than all instituted things in the world. . . . If you would make laws against whatever things God may please to send, laws to meet everything that may *happen*, you make a law in the face of God; you tell God you will meet all His dispensations, and will stay things whether He will or no. But if you make good laws of government, that men may know how to obey and to act for government, they may be laws that have frailty and weakness; ay, and yet good laws to be observed. But if nothing should ever be done but what is "according to law," the throat of the nation may be cut while we send for some to make a law! Therefore certainly it is a pitiful beastly notion to think, though it be for ordinary government to live by law and rule.

yet if a government in extraordinary circumstances go beyond the law even for self-preservation, it is to be clamoured at, and blottered at. When matters of necessity come, then without guilt extraordinary remedies may not be applied. Who can be so pitiful a person?

I confess, if necessity be *pretended*, there is so much the more sin. A laying the irregularity of men's actions upon God as if He had sent a necessity; who doth indeed send necessities. But to *anticipate* these—for as to an appeal to God, I own it—own this necessity conscientiously to God, and the principles of nature dictate the thing; but if there be a *supposition*, I say, of a necessity which is *not*, every *act* so done hath in it the more sin. This, whether in a given case there *is* a necessity or not, perhaps is rather to be disputed than otherwise; but I must say I do not know one action of this Government, no, not one, but it hath been in order to the peace and safety of the nation. And the keeping of some in prison hath been upon such clear and just grounds that no man can except against it. I know there are some imprisoned in the Isle of Wight, in Cornwall, and elsewhere; and the cause of their imprisonment was, they were all found acting things which tended to the disturbance of the peace of the nation. Now these principles made us say to them, "Pray live quietly in your own countries; you shall not be urged with bonds or engagements, or to subscribe to the government." But they would not so much as say, "We will promise to live peaceably." If others are imprisoned, it is because they have done such things. And if other particulars strike, we know what to say, as having endeavoured to walk as those that would not only give an account to God of their actings in authority, but had withal to give an account of them to men.

I confess I have digressed much. I would not have you be discouraged if you think the State is exceeding poor. Give me leave to tell you, we have managed the treasury not unthriftily, nor to private uses, but for the use of the nation and Government, and shall give you this short account. When the Long Parliament sat the nation owed £700,000. We examined it; it was brought unto that—in that short meeting of the Little Parliament, within half a year after the Government came into our hands. I believe there was *more* rather than less. They, the Long Parliament people, had £120,000 a month; they had the king's, queen's, prince's, bishop's lands; all delinquents' estates, and the dean-and-chapter lands, which was a very rich treasure. As soon as ever we came to the Government, we abated £30,000, the first half-year, and £60,000 after. We had no benefits of those estates, at all considerable; I do not think, the fiftieth part of what they had, and gave me leave to tell you, *you are not so much in debt as we found you.* We know it hath been maliciously dispersed, as if we had set the nation into £2,500,000 of debt: but I tell you, you are not so much in debt by some thousands—I think I may say, by some hundreds of thousands! This is true that I tell you. We have honestly—it may be not so wisely as some others would have done—but with honest and plain hearts, laboured and endeavoured the disposal of treasurer to public uses; and laboured to pull off the common charge £60,000 a month, as you see. And if we had continued that charge that was left upon the nation, perhaps we could have had as much money in hand as now we are in debt. These things being thus, I did think it my duty to give you this account, though it be wearisome even to yourselves and to me.

Now if I had the tongue of an angel; if I was so certainly inspired as the holy men of God have been, I could rejoice, for your sakes, and for these nations' sakes, and for the sake of God, and of His cause, which we have all been engaged in, if I could move affections in you to that which, if you do it, will save this nation. If *not*, you plunge it, to all human appearance, it and all interests, yea, and all Protestants in the world, into irrecoverable ruin.

Therefore I pray and beseech you, in the name of Christ, show yourselves to be men; "quit yourselves like men." It doth not infer any reproach if you do show yourselves men: *Christian* men, *which* alone *will* make you "quit yourselves." I do not think that, to this work you have in hand, a neutral spirit will do. That is a Laodicean spirit; and we know what God said of that church: it was "lukewarm," and therefore He would "spew it out of His mouth." It is not a neutral spirit that is incumbent upon you. And if not a neutral spirit, it is much less a stupefied spirit, inclining you, in the least disposition, the *wrong* way. Men are, in their private consciences, every day making shipwreck; and it's no wonder, if these can shake hands with persons of reprobate interests,—such, give me leave to think, are the popish interests. For the apostle brands them so, "having seared consciences." Though I do not judge every man—but the ringleaders are such. The Scriptures foretold there should be such. It is not such a spirit that will carry this work on. It is men in a Christian state, who have *works* with *faith*, who know how to lay hold on Christ for remission of sins, till a man be brought to "glory in hope." Such a hope kindled in men's spirits will actuate them to such ends as you are tending to; and so many as are partakers of that, and do own your standings, wherein the providence of God hath set and called you to this work, so many will carry it on.

If men, through scruple, be opposite, you cannot take them by the hand to *carry* them along with you—it were absurd; if a man be scrupling the plain truth before him, it is in vain to meddle with him. He hath placed another business in *his* mind; he is saying, "Oh,

if we could but exercise wisdom to gain civil liberty, religion would follow." Certainly there are such men, who are not *maliciously* blind, whom God, for some cause, exercises. It cannot be expected that they should do anything. These men—they must demonstrate that they are in bonds. . . . Could we have carried it thus far, if we had sat disputing in that manner? I must profess I reckon that difficulty more than all the wrestling with flesh and blood. Doubting, hesitating men, they are not fit for your work. You must not expect that men of hesitating spirits, under the bondage of scruples, will be able to carry on this work, much less such as are merely carnal, natural; such as having an "outward profession of godliness," whom the apostle speaks of so often, "are enemies to the cross of Christ, whose God is their belly, whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things." Do you think these men will rise to such a spiritual heat for the nation as shall carry you a cause like this; as will meet and defy all the oppositions that the devil and wicked men can make?

Give me leave to tell you—those that are called to this work, it will not depend for them upon formalities, nor notions, nor speeches. I do not look the work should be done by these. No; but by men of honest hearts, engaged to God; strengthened by Providence; enlightened in His words, to know His Word—to which He hath set His seal, sealed with the blood of His Son, with the blood of His servants; *that* is such a spirit as will carry on this work.

Therefore, I beseech you, do not dispute of unnecessary and unprofitable things which may divert you from carrying on so glorious a work as this is. I think *every* objection that ariseth is not to be answered, nor have I time for it. I say, look up to God; have peace among yourselves. Know assuredly that if I have interest, I am by the voice of the people the supreme magistrate; and, it may be, do know somewhat that might satisfy my conscience, if I stood in doubt. But it is a union, really it is a union, this between you and me; and both of us united in faith and love to Jesus Christ, and to His peculiar interest in the world—*that* must ground this work. And in *that*, if I have any peculiar interest which is personal to myself, which is not subservient to the public end—it were not an extravagant thing for me to *curse* myself, because I know God will curse me if I have. I have learned too much of God to dally with Him, and to be bold with Him in these things. And I hope I never shall be bold with Him, though I can be bold with men, if Christ be pleased to assist.

I say, if there be love between us, so that the nations may say, "These are knit together in one bond, to promote the glory of God against the common enemy, to suppress everything that is evil, and encourage whatsoever is of godliness"—yea, the nation will bless you. And really that and nothing else will work off these disaffections from the minds of men, which are great—perhaps greater than all the other oppositions you can meet with. I do know what I say. When I speak of these things, I speak my heart before God; and, as I said before, I dare not be bold with Him. I have a little faith; I have a little lived by faith, and therein I may be "bold." If I speak other than the affections and secrets of my heart, I know He would not bear it at my hands. Therefore, in the fear and name of God, go on, with love and integrity, against whatever arises of contrary to those ends which you know and have been told of; and the blessing of God go with you, and the blessing of God *will* go with you.

I have but one thing more to say. I know it is troublesome; but I did read a psalm yesterday, which truly may not unbecome both me to tell you of, and you to observe. It is the eighty-fifth Psalm; it is very instructive and significant; and though I do but a little touch upon it, I desire your perusal at pleasure.

It begins: "Lord, Thou hast been very favourable to Thy land; Thou hast brought back the captivity of Jacob. Thou hast forgiven the iniquity of Thy people; Thou hast covered all their sin. Thou hast taken away all the fierceness of Thy wrath; Thou hast turned Thyself from the fierceness of Thine anger. Turn us, O God of our salvation, and cause Thine anger toward us to cease. Wilt Thou be angry with us for ever; wilt Thou draw out Thine anger to all generations? Wilt Thou not revive us again, that Thy people may rejoice in Thee?" Then he calls upon God as "the God of his salvation," and then saith he: "I will hear what God the Lord will speak: for He will speak peace unto His people, and to His saints; but let them not turn again to folly. Surely His salvation is nigh them that fear Him;" Oh, "that glory may dwell in our land! Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other. Truth shall spring out of the earth, and righteousness shall look down from heaven. Yea, the Lord shall give that which is good, and our land shall yield her increase. Righteousness shall go before Him, and shall set us in the way of His steps."

Truly I wish that this psalm, as it is written in the Book, might be better written in our hearts. That we might say as David, "*Thou* hast done this," and "Thou hast done that;" "Thou hast pardoned our sins; Thou hast taken away our iniquities!" Whither can we go to a better God? For "He hath done it." It is to Him any nation may come in their extremity, for the taking away of His wrath. How did He do it? "By pardoning their sins, by taking away their iniquities!" If we can but cry unto Him, He will "turn and take away *our* sins." Then let us listen to Him. Then let us consult, and meet

in Parliament; and ask Him counsel, and hear what He saith, "for He will speak peace unto His people." If you be the people of God, He will speak *peace;* and we will not turn again to folly.

"Folly:" a great deal of grudging in the nation that we cannot have our horse-races, cock-fightings, and the like. I do not think that these are lawful, except to make them recreations. That we will not endure, for necessary ends, to be abridged of them. Till God hath brought us to another spirit than this, He will not bear with us. Ay, "but He bears with them in France;" "they in France are so and so!" Have they *the* Gospel as we have? They have seen the sun but a little; we have great lights. . . . If God give you a spirit of reformation, you will preserve this nation from "turning again" to these fooleries; and what will the end be? Comfort and blessing. Then "mercy and truth shall meet together." Here is a great deal of "truth" among professors, but very little "mercy!" They are ready to cut the throats of one another. But when we are brought into the right way, we shall be *merciful* as well as orthodox: and we know who it is that saith, "If a man could speak with the tongues of men and angels, and yet want *that*, he is but sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal!"

Therefore I beseech you in the name of God, set your hearts to this work. And if you set your hearts to it, then you will sing Luther's psalm. That is a rare psalm for a Christian; and if he set his heart open, and can approve it to God, we *shall* hear him say, "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in time of trouble." If Pope and Spaniard, and devil and all, set themselves against us, though they should "compass us like bees," as it is in the 118th Psalm, yet in the name of the Lord we should destroy them. And, as it is in this psalm of Luther's: "We will not fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the middle of the sea; though the waters thereof roar and be troubled; though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof." "There is a river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God. God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved." Then he repeats two or three times, "The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge."

I have done. All I have to say is, to pray God that He may bless you with His presence; that He who hath your hearts and mine would show His presence in the midst of us.

I desire you will go together, and choose your speaker.

ON DISSOLVING PARLIAMENT, 1658

My Lords, and Gentlemen of the House of Commons,—I had very comfortable expectations that God would make the meeting of this Parliament a blessing; and, the Lord be my witness, *I* desired the carrying on the affairs of the nation to these ends. The blessing which I mean, and which we ever climbed at, was mercy, truth, righteousness, and peace, which I desired might be improved.

That which brought me into the capacity I now stand in was the petition and advice given me by you, who, in reference to the ancient constitution, did draw me to accept the place of Protector. There is not a man living can say I sought it; no, not a man or woman treading upon English ground. But contemplating the sad condition of these nations, relieved from an intestine war into a six or seven years' peace, I did think the nation happy therein. But to be petitioned thereunto, and advised by you to undertake such a government, a burden too heavy for any creature; and this to be done by the House that then had the legislative capacity—certainly I did look that the same men who made the frame should make it good unto me. I can say in the presence of God, in comparison with whom we are but like poor creeping ants upon the earth, I would have been glad to have lived under my woodside, to have kept a flock of sheep, rather than undertaken such a government as this. But undertaking it by the advice and petition of you, I did look that you who had offered it unto me should make it good.

I did tell you, at a conference concerning it, that I would not undertake it, unless there might be some other persons to interpose between me and the House of Commons, who then had the power, and prevent tumultuary and popular spirits; and it was granted I should name another house. I named it of men that shall meet you wheresoever you go, and shake hands with you, and tell you it is not titles, nor lords, nor party that they value, but a Christian and an English interest—men of your own rank and quality, who will not only be a balance unto you, but to themselves, while you love England and religion.

Having proceeded upon these terms, and finding such a spirit as is too much dominant, everything being too high or too low, when virtue, honesty, piety, and justice are omitted, I thought I had been doing that which was my duty, and thought it would have satisfied you; but, if everything must be too high or too low, you are not to be satisfied.

Again, I would not have accepted of the government, unless I knew there would be a just accord between the governor and the governed, unless they would take an oath to make good what the Parliament's petition and advice advise me unto. Upon that I took an oath, and they took another oath upon their part, answerable to mine; and did not every one know upon what condition he swore? God knows I took it upon the conditions expressed in the act of government, and I did think we had been upon a foundation.

and upon a bottom, and thereupon I thought myself bound to take it, and to be advised by the two Houses of Parliament; and we standing unsettled till we were arrived at that, the consequences would necessarily have been confusion, if that had not been settled. Yet there are not constituted hereditary lords, nor hereditary kings, the power consisting in the two Houses and myself. I do not say that was the meaning of the oath to yourselves; that were to go against my own principles, to enter upon another man's conscience. God will judge between me and you. If there had been in you any intention of settlement, you would have settled upon this basis, and have offered your judgment and opinion.

God is my witness, I speak it; it is evident to all the world, and all people living, that a new business hath been seeking in the army against this actual settlement made by your own consent. I do not speak to these gentlemen or lords *(pointing to his right hand)*, or whatsoever you will call them. I speak not this to them, but to you; you advised me to run into this place, to be in a capacity by your advice, yet, instead of owning a thing taken for granted, some must have I know not what; and you have not only disjointed yourselves, but the whole nation, which is in likelihood of running into more confusion in these fifteen or sixteen days that you have sat, than it hath been from the rising of the last session to this day, through the intention of devising a commonwealth again, that some of the people might be the men that might rule all; and they are endeavouring to engage the army to carry that thing. And hath that man been true to this nation, whosoever he be, especially that hath taken an oath, thus to prevaricate? These designs have been made among the army to break and divide us. I speak this in the presence of some of the army, that these things have not been according to God, nor according to truth, pretend what you will. These things tend to nothing else but the playing the King of Scots game, if I may so call him, and I think myself bound to do what I can to prevent it.

That which I told you in the banqueting-house was true, that there were preparations of force to invade us. God is my witness, it has been confirmed to me since, not a day ago, that the King of Scots hath an army at the waterside, ready to be shipped for England. I have it from those who have been eye-witnesses of it; and while it is doing there are endeavours from some, who are not far from this place, to stir up the people of this town into a tumulting. What if I had said into a rebellion? It hath been not only your endeavour to pervert the army, while you have been sitting, and to draw them to state the question about the commonwealth, but some of you have been listing of persons, by commission of Charles Stuart, to join with any insurrection that may be made. And what is like to come upon this, the enemy being ready to invade us, but even present blood and confusion? And if this be so, I do assign it to this cause—your not assenting to what you did invite me to by your petition and advice, as that which might be the settlement of the nation. And if this be the end of your sitting, and this be your carriage, I think it high time that an end be put to your sitting, and I do dissolve this Parliament; and let God be judge between me and you.

THOMAS FULLER,

1608-1661.

HOW FAR EXAMPLES ARE TO BE FOLLOWED.*

In these words Naomi seeks to persuade Ruth to return, alleging the example of Orpah, who, as she saith, was "gone back to her people, and to her gods." Where first we find that all the heathen, and the Moabites amongst the rest, did not acknowledge one true God, but were the worshippers of many gods; for they made every attribute of God to be a distinct deity. Thus, instead of that attribute, the wisdom of God, they feigned Apollo the god of wisdom; instead of the power of God, they made Mars the god of power; instead of that admirable beauty of God, they had Venus the goddess of beauty. But no one attribute was so much abused as God's providence. For the heathen, supposing that the whole world, and all the creatures therein, was too great a diocese to be daily visited by one and the same deity, they therefore assigned sundry gods to several creatures. Thus God's providence in ruling the raging of the seas was counted Neptune; in stilling the roaring wind, Æolus; in commanding the powers of hell, Pluto; yea, sheep had their Pan, and gardens their Pomona; the heathens thus being as fruitful in feigning of gods as the Papists since in making of saints.

Now, because Naomi used the example of Orpah as a motive to work upon Ruth to return, we gather from thence, examples of others set

* "And Naomi said, Behold, thy sister-in-law is gone back unto her people, and unto her gods; return thou after thy sister-in-law" (Ruth i. 15).

before our eyes are very potent and prevailing arguments to make us follow and imitate them; whether they be good examples, so the forwardness of the Corinthians to relieve the Jews provoked many,—or whether they be bad, so the dissembling of Peter at Antioch drew Barnabas and others into the same fault. But those examples, of all others, are most forcible with us which are set by such who are near to us by kindred, or gracious with us in friendship, or great over us in power.

Let men in eminent places, as magistrates, ministers, fathers, masters (so that others love to dance after their pipe, to sing after their music, to tread after their track), endeavour to propound themselves examples of piety and religion to those that be under them.

When we see any good example propounded unto us, let us strive with all possible speed to imitate it. What a deal of stir is there in the world for civil precedency and pribrity! Every one desires to march in the forefront, and thinks it a shame to come lagging in the rearward. O that there were such a holy ambition and heavenly emulation in our hearts, that, as Peter and John ran a race who should come first to the grave of our Saviour, so men would contend who should first attain to true mortification. And when we see a good example set before us, let us imitate it, though it be in one which in outward respects is far our inferior. Shall not our masters be ashamed to see that their men, whose place on earth is to come behind them, in piety towards heaven go before them? Shall not the husband blush to see his wife, who is the weaker vessel in nature, the stronger vessel in grace? Shall not the elder brother dye his cheeks with the colour of virtue, to see his younger brother, who was last born, first re-born by faith and the Holy Ghost? Yet let him not therefore envy his brother, as Cain did Abel; let him not be angry with his brother because he is better than himself; but let him be angry with himself, because he is worse than his brother; let him turn all his malice into imitation, all his fretting at him into following of him. Say unto him, as Gehazi did of Naaman, "As the Lord liveth, I will run after him;" and although thou canst not overrun him, nor as yet overlook him; yet give not over to run with him, follow him, though not as Asahel did Abner, hard at the heels; yet as Peter did our Saviour, "afar off;" that though the more slowly, yet as surely thou mayest come to heaven; and though thou wert short of him while he lived, in the race, yet thou shalt be even with him when thou art dead, at the mark.

When any bad example is presented unto us, let us decline and detest it, though the men be never so many or so dear unto us. Imitate Micaiah (1 Kings xxii.), to whom, when the messenger sent to fetch him said, "Behold now, the words of the prophets declare good unto the king with one mouth; let thy word therefore, I pray thee, be like to one of them;" Micaiah answered, "As the Lord liveth, whatsoever the Lord saith unto me, that will I speak." If they be never so dear unto us, we must not follow their bad practice. So must the son please him that begot him, that he doth not displease Him that created him: so must the wife follow him that married her, that she doth not offend Him that made her. Wherefore, as Samson, though bound with new cords, snapped them asunder as tow when it feeleth the fire; so, rather than we should be led by the lewd examples of those that be near and dear unto us, let us break in pieces all their engagements, relations whatsoever.

Now here it will be a labour worthy discourse to consider how far the examples even of good men in the Bible are to be followed. For, as all examples have a great influence on the practice of the beholders, so especially the deeds of good men registered in the Scripture (the calendar of eternity) are most attractive of imitation.

First Kind of Examples.—We find in Holy Writ nine several kinds of examples. First, *actions extraordinary;* the doers whereof had peculiar strength and dispensation from God to do them. Thus, Phinehas in a heavenly fury killed Cozbi and Zimri; Samson slew himself and the Philistines in the temple of Dagon; Elias caused fire to descend on the two captains of fifties; Elisha cursed the children, the children of Bethel.

Use of them.—These are written for our instruction, not for our imitation. If, with Elisha, thou canst make a bridge over Jordan with thy cloak, if, with him, thou canst raise dead children, then it is lawful for thee, with Elisha, to curse thy enemies. If thou canst not imitate him in the one, pretend not to follow him in the other.

Abuse of them.—When men propound such examples for their practice, what is said is imputed to Phinehas for righteousness will be imputed to us for iniquity, if, being private men, by a commission of our own penning, we usurp the sword of justice to punish malefactors.

Second Sort.—*Actions founded in the ceremonial law:* as, Abraham's circumcising of Isaac, Hezekiah's eating the passover, Solomon's offering of sacrifices, etc.

Use of them.—We are to be thankful to God, that these shadows in Christ the substance are taken away. Let us not therefore superstitiously feign that the ghosts of these ceremonies may still walk, which long since were buried in Christ's grave.

Abuse of them.—By those who still retain them. Excellently Ignatius, *Epist. ad Magnesios*, Οὐ γὰρ Χριστιανισμὸς οὐκ ἔστιν Ἰουδαϊσμός. Yea, we must forfeit the name of Christians, if we still retain such old rites. Let those who are admitted in the college of grace, disdain any longer to go to the school of the ceremonial law, which truly may be called "the school of Tyrannus."

THIRD SORT.—*Actions which are founded in the judicial law;* as, punishing theft with fourfold restitution, putting of adulterers to death, and raising up seed to the brother, etc.

Use of them.—These oblige men to observe them so far as they have in them any taste or tincture of a moral law; and as they bear proportion with those statutes by which every particular country is governed. For the judicial law was by God calculated alone for the elevation of the Jewish commonwealth. It suited only with the body of their state; and will not fit any other commonwealth, except it be equal to Judea in all dimensions—I mean in climate, nature of the soil, disposition of the people, quality of the bordering neighbours, and many other particulars, amongst which the very least is considerable.

Abuse of them.—When men, out of an over-imitativeness of holy precedents, seek to conform all countries to Jewish laws. That must needs break, which is stretched further than God intended it. They may sooner make Saul's armour fit David, and David's sling and scrip become Saul, than the particular statutes of one country adequately to comply with another.

FOURTH SORT.—*Actions founded in no law at all, but only in an ancient custom,* by God winked and connived at; yea, tolerated, at the leastwise not openly forbidden in precept, or punished in practice. As polygamy, in the patriarchs having many wives. Indeed, when God first made the large volume of the world, and all creatures therein, and set it forth, *cum regali privilegio,* "Behold, all things therein were very good," He made one Eve for one Adam. Polygamy is an *erratum,* and needs an *Index expurgatorius,* being crept in, being more than what was in the maiden copy; it was the creature of Lamech, no work of God.

Use.—We are herein to wonder at and praise the goodness of God, who was pleased herein to wink at the faults of His dear saints, and to pass by their frailty herein, because they lived in a dark age, wherein His pleasure was not so plainly manifested.

Abuse of them.—If any, in this bright sunshine of the Gospel, pretend, as a plea for their lust, to follow their example.

FIFTH SORT.—*Doubtful examples;* which may be so termed, because it is difficult to decide whether the actors of them therein did offend or no; so that, should a jury of learned writers be empannelled to pass their verdict upon them, they would be puzzled whether to condemn or acquit them, and at last be forced to find it an *Ignoramus.* As, whether David did well to dissemble himself frantic, thereby to escape the cruelty of Achish, king of Gath: whether Hushai did well in counterfeiting with Absalom, or whether therein he did not make heaven to bow too much to earth; I mean, policy to intrench upon piety; and so in this act was so good a statesman that he was a bad man.

Use of them.—Let us not meddle with imitation of these actions, that are so full of difficulty and danger that our judgments therein may easily be deceived. The sons of Barzallai (Ezra ii. 63), because their genealogies were doubtful and uncertain, were put by the priesthood, till a priest should rise up "with Urim and Thummin;" by which we may understand some especial man amongst them, who, by God's spirit, might be able to decide the controversies which were questioned in their pedigrees. So let us refrain from following these doubtful examples, till (which in this world is not likely to be) there arise an infallible judge, who can determine in these particulars, whether these actions were well done or no.

Abuse of them.—By such who, though they have room enough besides, yet delight to walk on a narrow bank near the sea, and have an itch to imitate these doubtful examples, wherein there is great danger of miscarrying.

SIXTH SORT.—*Mixed examples,* which contain in them a double action, the one good, and the other bad, so closely couched together that it is a very hard thing to sever them. Thus, in the unjust steward, there was his wisdom to provide for himself, which God doth commend; and his wickedness, to purloin from his master, which God cannot but condemn. Thus, in the Hebrew midwives (Exod. i.), when they told the lie, there was in them *fides mentis, et fallacia mentientis,* the "faithfulness" of their love to their countrymen, and the "falseness of their lying" to Pharaoh.

Use of them.—Behold, here is wisdom, and let the man that hath understanding discreetly divide betwixt the gold and the dross, the wheat and the chaff; what he is to follow and imitate, and what to shun and avoid. In the first year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the students of Christ Church, in Oxford, buried the bones of Peter Martyr's wife in the same coffin with the ashes of Fridswick, a popish saint; to this intent, that if Popery (which God forbid) should ever after overspread this land, Papists should be puzzled to part the ashes of a supposed heretic from one of their canonised saints. Thus, in some actions of God's saints in the Bible, which are of a mixed nature; wickedness doth so insensibly unite and incorporate itself with that that is good, that it is very difficult to sever and divide them without a sound and well advised judgment.

Abuse of them.—In such as leave what is good, take what is bad; follow what is to be shunned, shun what is to be followed.

SEVENTH SORT.—*Actions absolutely bad,* so that no charitable comment can be fastened upon them, except we will incur the prophet's curse and woe, to "call good evil, and evil good." Such were the drunkenness of Noah,

the incest of Lot, the lying of Abraham, the swearing of Joseph, the adultery of David, the denial of Peter.

Use of them.—Let us read in them, first, a lecture of our own infirmity. Who dare warrant his armour for proof, when David's was shot through? Secondly, let us admire and laud God's mercy, who pardoned and restored these men on their unfeigned repentance. Lastly, let us not despair of pardon ourselves, if through infirmity overtaken, God in like manner is merciful to forgive us.

Abuse of them.—When men either make these their patterns, by which they sin; or after their sinning, allege them for their excuse and defence. Thus Judith did (Judith ix. 2). For whereas that murder which Simeon and Levi did commit upon the Shechemites (Gen. xxxiv. 25), was cursed by Jacob as a most heinous and horrible sin; yet she propounds it as a heroic act, and the unworthy precedent for her imitation: "O Lord God of my father Simeon, to whom thou gavest the sword to take vengeance on the strangers, which opened the womb of a maid, and defiled her," etc. Well, if the arm of Judith had been as weak as her judgment was herein, I should scarce believe that she ever cut off the head of Holophernes.

EIGHTH SORT.—*Actions which are only good as they are qualified with such a circumstance,* as David's eating the showbread in a case of absolute necessity, which otherwise was provided for the priests alone. Such are the doing of servile works on the Lord's Day, when, in case of necessity, they leave off to be *opera servilia,* and become *opera misericordiæ.*

Use of them.—Let us be sure, in imitating of these, to have the same qualifying circumstance, without which otherwise the deed is impious and damnable.

Abuse of them.—In those who imitate the example without any heeding that they are so qualified as the action requires.

NINTH SORT.—The ninth and last sort remains; and such are *those which are eminently good;* as, the faith of Abraham, the meekness of Moses, the valour of Joshua, the sincerity of Samuel, the plain dealing of Nathanael, etc. Follow not, then, the infidelity of Thomas, but the faith of Abraham; the testiness of Jonah, but the patience of Job; the adultery of David, but the chastity of Joseph—not the apostasy of Orpah, but the perseverance of Ruth here in my text.

AN ILL MATCH WELL BROKEN OFF.*

The Stoics said to their affections as Abimelech spake to Isaac (Gen. xxvi. 16), "Get you out from amongst us; for you are too strong for us." Because they were too strong for them to master, they therefore would have them totally banished out of their souls, and labour to becalm themselves with an apathy. But far be it from us, after their example, to root out such good herbs (instead of weeds) out of the garden of our nature; whereas affections, if well used, are excellent, if they mistake not their true object, nor exceed in their due measure. Joshua killed not the Gibeonites, but condemned them to be "hewers of wood and drawers of water for the sanctuary." We need not expel passions out of us, if we could conquer them, and make grief draw water-buckets of tears for our sins, and anger kindle fires of zeal and indignation when we see God dishonoured. But as that must needs be a deformed face, wherein there is a transposition of the colours—the blueness of the veins being set in the lips; the redness which should be in the cheeks in the nose—so, alas! most misshapen is our soul, since Adam's fall, whereby our affections are so inverted, joy stands where grief should, grief in the place of joy. We are bold where we should fear, fear where we should be bold; love what we should hate, hate what we should love. This gave occasion to the blessed apostle, in my text, to dissuade men from loving that whereon too many dote. "Love not the world."

For the better understanding of which words, know that the devil goes about to make an unfitting match betwixt the soul of a Christian on the one party, and this world on the other. A match too likely to go on, if we consider the simplicity and folly of many Christians (because of the remnants of corruption), easily to be seduced and inveigled, or the bewitching, enticing, alluring nature of this world; but God, by St John, in my text, forbiddeth the banns—"Love not the world."

In prosecuting whereof, we will first show the worthiness of a Christian soul; then we will consider the worthlessness of the world; and from the comparing of these two, this doctrine will result, that *it is utterly unfitting for a Christian to place his affections on worldly things.*

Let us take notice of a Christian's possessions, and of his possibilities; what he hath in hand, and what he holdeth in hope. In possession he hath the favour of God, the spirit of adoption crying in him, "Abba, Father," and many excellent graces of sanctification in some measure in his heart. In hope and expectance he hath the reversion of heaven and happiness (a reversion not to be got after another's death, but his own), and those happinesses which eye cannot see, nor ear hear, neither it can enter into the heart of man to conceive.

Now see the worthlessness of the world. Three loadstones commonly attract men's affections, and make them to love—beauty, wit, and wealth.

Beauty the world hath none at all. I dare

* "Love not the world" (1 John ii. 15).

boldly say the world put on her holiday apparel when she was presented by the devil to our Saviour (Matt. iv. 9). She never looked so smug and smooth before or since, and had there been any real beauty therein, the eagle sight of our Saviour would have seen it: yet, when all the glory of the world was proffered unto Him at the price of idolatry, He refused it. Yet, as old Jezebel, when she wanted true beauty, stopped up the leaks of age with adulterated complexion, and painted her face; so the world, in default of true beauty, decks herself with a false appearing fairness, which serves to allure amorous fools, and (to give the world, as well as the devil, her due) she hath for the time a kind of a pleasing fashionableness. But what saith St Paul? "The fashion of this world passeth away" (1 Cor. vii. 31). The *wit* of the world is as little as her beauty, however it may be cried up by some of her fond admirers; yet as it is (1 Cor. iii. 19), "The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God;" and *Cuilibet artifici credandum est in suâ arte;* what Wisdom itself counts foolishness is folly to purpose.

Her *wealth* is as small as either: what the world calls "substance" is most subject to accidents, uncertain, unconstant; even lands themselves in this respect are movables. "Riches make themselves wings, and fly away;" they may leave us whilst we live, but we must leave them when we die.

Seeing, then, the world hath so little, and the Christian soul so much, let us learn a lesson of holy pride, to practise heavenly ambition. Descend not so far, O Christian, beneath thyself; remember what thou art, and what thou hast; lose not thyself in lavishing thy affections on so disproportioned a mate. There is a double disparity betwixt thy soul and the world.

First, that of *age*. Perchance the world might make a fit mate for thy old man, thy unregenerate half, thy relics of sin; but to match the old, rotten, withered, worm-eaten world to thy new man, thy new creature, the regenerated and renewed part of thy soul, grey to green, is rather a torture than a marriage—altogether disproportionable.

Secondly, that of *quality or condition*. Thou art God's free-man. "If I have freed you," saith Christ, "then are you free indeed;" the world is, or ought to be, thy slave, thy vassal. "For whosoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith" (1 John v. 4). Be not, then, so base as to make thy vassal thy mate. Alexander denied to marry Darius's daughter, though proffered unto him, scorning to be conquered by her beauty, whose father he had conquered by his valour. Let us not make the world our mistress, whereof we ought to be the master, nor prostitute our affections to a slave we have conquered.

Objection.—Yea, may some say, this is good counsel, if it came in due season. Alas! now it cometh too late, after I have not only long doted, but am even wedded to this world. Infant affection may be easily crushed, but who can tame an old and rooted love? Think you that I have my affection in my hand, as hunters their dogs, to let slip or rate off at pleasure? How, then, shall I unlove the world, which hath been my bosom darling so long?

Answer.—Art thou wedded to the world? then instantly send her a bill of divorce. It need never trouble thy conscience; that match may be lawfully broken off, which was first most unlawfully made. Yea, thou wert long before contracted to God in thy baptism, wherein thou didst solemnly promise thou wouldst "forsake the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of this world." Let the first contract stand; and because it is difficult for those who have long doted on the world to unlove her, we will give some rules how it may be done by degrees. For indeed it is not to be done on a sudden (matters of moment cannot be done in a moment); but it is the task of a man's whole life, till the day of his death.

Rules how to unlove the world.—1. Look not with the eyes of covetousness or admiration on the things of the world. The eye is the principal Cinque Port of the soul, wherein love first arrives: *Ut vidi, ut perii!* Now thou mayest look on the things of the world *ut in transitu*—"as in passage" (otherwise we should be forced to shut our eyes); and we may behold them with a slighting, neglectful, fastidious look. But take heed to look on them with a covetous eye, as Eve on the forbidden fruit, and Achan on the wedge of gold. Take heed to look on them with the eye of admiration, as the disciples looked on the buildings of the temple (Matt. xxiv. 1), wondering at the eternity of the structure, and conceiving the arch of this world would fall as soon as such stones, riveted to immortality, might be dissolved. Wherefore our Saviour checketh them, "Verily I say unto you, There shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be cast down." Excellently Job (xxxi. 1), "I have made a covenant with mine eyes, that I should not behold a woman." A covenant? But what was the forfeiture Job's eyes were to pay in case he brake it? It is not expressed on the bond; but surely the penalty is implied,—many brackish tears, which his eyes in repentance must certainly pay, if they observed not the covenant.

2. Silence that spokesman in thy bosom; I mean, the allurements of the flesh and devil, who improveth his utmost power to advance a match betwixt thy soul and the world. And when any breach happens between thee and the world, so that thou art ready to cast her off, the flesh in thy bosom pleads her cause. "Why wilt thou," saith it, "deprive thyself of those contentments which the world would afford

thee? Why dost thou torment thyself before thy time? Ruffle thyself in the silks of security; it will be time enough to put on the sackcloth of repentance when thou liest on thy deathbed." Hearken not to the flesh, her enchantments; but as Pharaoh charged Moses to get him out of his presence, he should "see his face no more" (Exod. x. 28), so strive, as much as in thee lieth, to expel these fleshly suggestions from thy presence, to banish them out of thy soul; at leastwise to silence them; though the mischief is, it will be muttering, and though it dare not halloo, it will still be whispering unto thee, in behalf of the world, its old friend, to make a reconciliation betwixt you.

3. Send back again to the world the love-tokens she hath bestowed upon thee; I mean those ill-gotten goods which thou hast gotten by indirect and unwarrantable means. As for those goods which thy parents left thee, friends have given thee, or thou hast procured by Heaven's providence on thy lawful endeavours, these are no love-tokens of the world, but God's gifts; keep them, use them, enjoy them, to His glory. But goods gotten by wrong and robbery, extortion and bribery, force and fraud, these restore and send back: for the world knoweth that she hath a kind of tie and engagement upon thee, so long as thou keepest her tokens; and in a manner thou art obliged in honour, as long as thou detainest the gifts that were hers. Imitate Zaccheus: see how he casts back what the world gave him, "Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation, I restore him fourfold" (Luke xix. 8).

4. Set thy affections on the God of heaven. The best wedge to drive out an old love is to take in a new.

"Postquam nos Amaryllis habit, Galatea reliquit."

Yea, God deserves our love first, because God "loved us first" (1 John iv. 19). It is enough, indeed, to blunt the sharpest affection, to be returned with scorn and neglect; but it is enough to turn ice into ashes, to be first beloved by One that so well deserves love. Secondly, His is a lasting love: "Having loved His own that were in the world, He loved them to the end" (John xiii. 1). Some men's affection spends itself with its violence, hot at hand, but cold at length; God's is not so—it is continuing. It is recorded in the honour of our King Henry VII., that he never discomposed a favourite, one only excepted, which was William, Lord Stanley; a rare matter, since many princes change their favourites, as well as their clothes, before they are old. But the observation is true of the Lord of heaven without any exception: those who are once estated in His favour, He continues loving unto them to the end.

Hark, then, how He woos us, Isa. lv. 1: "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come," etc. How He woos us, Matt. xi. 28? "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Love His love-letter, His Word, His love-tokens, His sacraments, His spokesmen, his ministers, which labour to favour the match betwixt Him and thy soul. But beware of two things.

1. Take heed of that dangerous conceit, that at the same time thou mayest keep both God and the world, and love these outward delights, as a concubine to thy soul. Nay, God He is "a jealous God;" He will have all, or none at all. There is a city in Germany, pertaining half to the bishop thereof, and half to the Duke of Saxony, who named the city Myndyn, that is, "mine and thine;" because it was theirs *communi jure*, and at this day by corruption it is called Minden. But God will admit of no such divisions; He will hold nothing in coparceny; He will not share or part stakes with any; but He will have all entire to himself alone.

2. Take heed thou dost not only fall out with the world, to fall in with it again, according to that

"Amantium iræ amoris redintegratio est."

For even as some furious gamesters, when they have a bad game, throw their cards out of their hands, and vow to play no more (not so much out of mislike of gaming as of their present game); but when the cards run on their side, they are reconciled to them again; so many men, when the world frowns on them and crosses them, and they miss some preferment they desire, then a qualm of piety comes over their hearts; they are mortified on a sudden, and disavow to have any further dealing with worldly contentments. But when the world smiles on them again, favours and prospers them, they then return to their former love, and doting upon it. Thus Demas (2 Tim. iv. 10) would needs have another farewell embrace of the world, even after his solemn conversion to Christianity: "Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world." But when we are once at variance with the world, let us continue at deadly eternal feuds with it; and as it is said of Amnon (2 Sam. xiii. 15), that "the hatred wherewith he hated his sister Tamar was greater than the love wherewith he had loved her;" so (what was cruelty in him will be Christianity in us), once fallen out with the world, let the joint be never set again, that it may be the stronger; but let our hatred be immortal, and so much the stronger by how much our love was before.

JEREMY TAYLOR.

1613-1667.

THE MARRIAGE RING; OR, THE MYSTERIOUSNESS AND DUTIES OF MARRIAGE.*

PART I.

THE first blessing God gave to man was society, and that society was a marriage, and that marriage was confederate by God himself, and hallowed by a blessing; and, at the same time, and for many descending ages, not only by the instinct of nature, but by a superadded forwardness (God himself inspiring the desire), the world was most desirous of children, impatient of barrenness, accounting single life a curse, and a childless person hated by God. The world was rich and empty, and able to provide for a more numerous posterity than it had. . . . You that are rich, Numenius, you may multiply your family; poor men are not so fond of children; but when a family could drive their herds, and set their children on camels, and lead them till they saw a fat soil watered with rivers, and there sit down without paying rent, they thought of nothing but to have great families, that their own relations might swell up to a patriarchate, and their children be enough to possess all the regions that they saw, and their grandchildren become princes, and themselves build cities and call them by the name of a child, and become the fountain of a nation. This was the consequent of the first blessing, "increase and multiply." The next blessing was the promise of the Messias, and that also increased in men and women a wonderful desire of marriage; for as soon as God had chosen the family of Abraham to be the blessed line, from whence the world's Redeemer should descend according to the flesh, every one of his daughters hoped to have the honour to be his mother, or his grandmother, or something of his kindred; and to be childless in Israel was a sorrow to the Hebrew women great as the slavery of Egypt, or their dishonours in the land of their captivity.

But when the Messias was come, and the doctrine was published, and His ministers but few, and His disciples were to suffer persecution, and to be of an unsettled dwelling; and the nation of the Jews, in the bosom and society of which the Church especially did dwell, were to be scattered and broken all in pieces with fierce calamities, and the world was apt to calumniate and to suspect and dishonour Christians on pretences and unreasonable jealousies, and that to all these purposes the state of marriage brought many inconveniences; it pleased God in this new creation to inspire into the hearts of His servants a disposition and strong desires to live a single life, lest the state of marriage should in that conjunction of things become an accidental impediment to the dissemination of the Gospel, which called men from a confinement in their domestic charges to travel, and flight, and poverty, and difficulty, and martyrdom: on this necessity the apostles and apostolical men published doctrines, declaring the advantages of single life, not by any commandment of the Lord, but by the spirit of prudence, "for the present and then incumbent necessities," and in order to the advantages which did accrue to the public ministries and private piety. "There are some," said our blessed Lord, "who make themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven," that is, for the advantages and the ministry of the Gospel, *non ad vitæ bonæ meritum*, as St Austin in the like case; not that it is a better service of God in itself, but that it is useful to the first circumstances of the Gospel and the infancy of the kingdom, because the unmarried person "is apt to spiritual and ecclesiastical employments:" first ἅγιος, and then ἁγιαζόμενος, "holy in his own person, and then sanctified to public ministries;" and it was also of ease to the Christians themselves, because, as then it was, when they were to flee, and to flee for aught they knew in winter, and they were persecuted to the four winds of heaven; and the nurses and the women with child were to suffer a heavier load of sorrow because of the imminent persecutions; and, above all, because of the great fatality of ruin on the whole nation of the Jews, well it might be said by St Paul, "such shall have trouble in the flesh," that is, they that are married shall, and so at that time they had; and therefore it was an act of charity to the Christians to give that counsel, "I do this to spare you;" for when the case was altered, and that storm was over, and the first necessities of the Gospel served, and "the sound was gone out into all nations;" in very many persons it was wholly changed, and not the married but the unmarried had "trouble in the flesh," and the state of marriage returned to its first blessing, "and it was not good for man to be alone."

But in this first interval, the public necessity and the private zeal mingling together did sometimes overact their love of single life, even to the disparagement of marriage, and to the scandal

* "This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the Church. Nevertheless, let every one of you so love his wife even as himself, and the wife see that she reverence her husband" (Eph. v. 32, 33).

of religion, which was increased by the occasion of some pious persons renouncing their contract of marriage, not consummate, with believers. For when Flavia Domitilla, being converted by Nereus and Achilleus, the eunuchs, refused to marry Aurelianus, to whom she was contracted, if there were not some little envy and too sharp hostility in the eunuchs to a married state, yet Aurelianus thought himself an injured person, and caused St Clemens, who veiled her, and his spouse both, to die in the quarrel. St Thecla, being converted by St Paul, grew so in love with virginity, that she leaped back from the marriage of Tamyris, where she was lately engaged. St Iphigenia denied to marry King Hyrtacus, and it is said to be done by the advice of St Matthew. And Susanna, the niece of Dioclesian, refused the love of Maximianus the emperor; and these all had been betrothed; and so did St Agnes and St Felicula, and divers others then and afterward; insomuch that it was reported among the Gentiles that the Christians did not only hate all that were not of their persuasion, but were enemies of the chaste laws of marriage; and, indeed, some that were called Christians were so, "forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats." On this occasion it grew necessary for the apostle to state the question right, and to do honour to the holy rite of marriage, and to snatch the mystery from the hands of zeal and folly, and to place it in Christ's right hand, that all its beauties might appear, and a present convenience might not bring in a false doctrine, and a perpetual sin, and an intolerable mischief. The apostle, therefore, who himself had been a married man, but was now a widower, does explicate the mysteriousness of it, and describes its honours, and adorns it with rules and provisions of religion, that, as it begins with honour, so it may proceed with piety, and end with glory.

For although single life hath in it privacy and simplicity of affairs, such solitariness and sorrow, such leisure and inactive circumstances of living, that there are more spaces for religion if men would use them to these purposes; and because it may have in it much religion and prayers, and must have in it a perfect mortification of our strongest appetites, it is therefore a state of great excellency; yet concerning the state of marriage we are taught from Scripture and the sayings of wise men, great things and honourable. "Marriage is honourable in all men;" so is not single life, for in some it is a snare and a πύρωσις, "a trouble in the flesh," a prison of unruly desires, which is attempted daily to be broken. Celibate or single life is never commanded, but, in some cases, marriage is, and he that burns sins often if he marries not; he that cannot contain must marry, and he that can contain is not tied to a single life, but may marry and not sin. Marriage was ordained by God, instituted in Paradise, was the relief of a natural necessity, and the first blessing from the Lord. He gave to man not a friend, but a wife; that is, a friend and a wife too; for a good woman is in her soul the same that a man is, and she is a woman only in her body, that she may have the excellency of the one, and the usefulness of the other, and become amiable in both. It is the seminary of the Church, and daily brings forth sons and daughters unto God; it was ministered to by angels, and Raphael waited upon a young man that he might have a blessed marriage, and that that marriage might repair two sad families, and bless all their relatives. Our blessed Lord, though He was born of a maiden, yet she was veiled under the cover of marriage, and she was married to a widower; for Joseph, the supposed father of our Lord, had children by a former wife. The first miracle that ever Jesus did, was to do honour to a wedding. Marriage was in the world before sin, and is in all ages of the world the greatest and most effective antidote against sin, in which all the world had perished, if God had not made a remedy; and although sin hath soured marriage, and stuck the man's head with cares, and the woman's bed with sorrows in the production of children, yet these are but throes of life and glory, and "she shall be saved in child-bearing, if she be found in faith and righteousness." Marriage is a school and exercise of virtue; and though marriage hath cares, yet the single life hath desires which are more troublesome and more dangerous, and often end in sin, while the cares are but instances of duty and exercises of piety; and therefore if single life hath more privacy of devotion, yet marriage hath more necessities, and more variety of it, and is an exercise of more graces. In two virtues celibate or single life may have the advantage of degrees ordinarily and commonly, —that is, in chastity and devotion; but as in some persons this may fail, and it does in very many, and a married man may spend as much time in devotion as any virgins or widows do, yet, as in marriage, even those virtues of chastity and devotion are exercised, so in other instances this state hath proper exercises and trials for those graces for which single life can never be crowned. Here is the proper scene of piety and patience, of the duty of parents and the charity of relatives; here kindness is spread abroad, and love is united and made firm as a centre. Marriage is the nursery of heaven; the virgin sends prayers to God, but she carries but one soul to Him; but the state of marriage fills up the numbers of the elect, and hath in it the labour of love, and the delicacies of friendship, the blessing of society, and the union of hands and hearts; it hath in it less of beauty, but more of safety, than the single life; it hath more care, but less danger; it is more merry, and more sad; is fuller of sorrows, and fuller of joys; it lies under more burdens, but it is supported by all the strengths of love and charity, and those

burdens are delightful. Marriage is the mother of the world, and preserves kingdoms, and fills cities and churches, and heaven itself. Celibate, like the fly in the heart of an apple, dwells in a perpetual sweetness, but sits alone, and is confined, and dies in singularity; but marriage, like the useful bee, builds a house and gathers sweetness from every flower, and labours and unites into societies and republics, and sends out colonies, and feeds the world with delicacies, and obeys its king, and keeps order, and exercises many virtues, and promotes the interest of mankind, and is that state of good things to which God hath designed the present constitution of the world.

Single life makes men in one instance to be like angels, but marriage in very many things makes the chaste pair to be like to Christ. "This is a great mystery," but it is the symbolical and sacramental representation of the greatest mysteries of our religion. Christ descended from His Father's bosom, and contracted His divinity with flesh and blood, and married our nature, and we became a Church, the spouse of the Bridegroom, which He cleansed with His blood, and gave her His Holy Spirit for a dowry, and heaven for a jointure, begetting children unto God by the Gospel. This spouse He hath joined to Himself by an excellent charity; He feeds her at His own table, and lodges her nigh His own heart, provides for all her necessities, relieves her sorrows, determines her doubts, guides her wanderings; He is become her head, and she as a signet upon His right hand. He first indeed was betrothed to the Synagogue, and had many children by her, but she forsook her love, and then He married the Church of the Gentiles, and by her, as by a second venter, had a more numerous issue; "all the children dwell in the same house," and are heirs of the same promises, entitled to the same inheritance. Here is the eternal conjunction, the indissoluble knot, the exceeding love of Christ, the obedience of the spouse, the communicating of goods, the uniting of interests, the fruit of marriage, a celestial generation, a new creature. "This is the sacramental mystery" represented by the holy rite of marriage, so that marriage is divine in its institution, sacred in its union, holy in the mystery, sacramental in its signification, honourable in its appellative, religious in its employment; it is advantage to the societies of men, and it is "holiness to the Lord." "It must be in Christ and the Church."

If this be not observed, marriage loses its mysteriousness; but because it is to effect much of that which it signifies, it concerns all that enter into those golden fetters to see that Christ and His Church be in at every of its periods, and that it be entirely conducted and overruled by religion; for so the apostle passes from the sacramental rite to the real duty; "Nevertheless," that is, although the former discourse were wholly to explicate the conjunction of Christ and His Church by this similitude, yet it hath in it this real duty, "that the man love his wife, and the wife reverence her husband;" and this is the use we shall now make of it, the particulars of which precept I shall thus dispose:

1. I shall propound the duty as it generally relates to man and wife in conjunction. 2. The duty and power of the man. 3. The rights and privileges and the duty of the wife.

1. *In Christo et ecclesia;* that begins all, and there is great need it should be so; for they that enter into a state of marriage, cast a die of the greatest contingency, and yet of the greatest interest in the world, next to the last throw for eternity. Life or death, felicity or a lasting sorrow, are in the power of marriage. A woman indeed ventures most, for she hath no sanctuary to retire from an evil husband, she must dwell on her sorrow, and hatch the eggs which her own folly or infelicity hath produced; and she is more under it, because her tormentor hath a warrant of prerogative, and the woman may complain to God, as subjects do of tyrant princes, but otherwise she hath no appeal in the causes of unkindness. And though the man can run from many hours of his sadness, yet he must return to it again; and when he sits among his neighbours, he remembers the objection that lies in his bosom, and he sighs deeply.

The boys, and the pedlars, and the fruiterers, shall tell of this man, when he is carried to his grave, that he lived and died a poor wretched person. The stags in the Greek epigram, whose knees were clogged with frozen snow in the mountains, came down to the brooks of the valleys, "hoping to thaw their joints with the waters of the stream;" but there the frost overtook them, and bound them fast in ice, till the young herdsmen took them in their stronger snare. It is the unhappy chance of many men; finding many inconveniences upon the mountains of single life, they descend into the valleys of marriage to refresh their troubles, and there they enter into fetters, and are bound to sorrow by the cords of a man's or woman's peevishness: and the worst of the evil is, they are to thank their own follies, for they fell into the snare by entering an improper way; Christ and the Church were no ingredients in their choice. But as the Indian women enter into folly for the price of an elephant, and think their crime warrantable; so do men and women change their liberty for a rich fortune (like Eriphyle the Argive, "she preferred gold before a good man"), and show themselves to be less than money by overvaluing that to all the content and wise felicity of their lives; and when they have counted the money and their sorrows together, how willingly would they buy, with the loss of all that money, modesty, or sweet nature, to their relative. The odd thousand pounds would gladly be allowed in good nature and fair manners. As very a fool is he

that chooses for beauty principally; *cui sunt eruditi oculi, et stulta mens*, as one said, "whose eyes are witty, and their souls sensual:" it is an ill band of affections to tie two hearts by a little thread of red and white, and they can love no longer but until the next ague comes, and they are fond of each other but at the chance of fancy, or the smallpox, or childbearing, or care, or time, anything that can destroy a pretty flower. But it is the basest of all when lust is the paranymph, and solicits the suit, and makes the contract, and joins the hands; for this is commonly the effect of the former, according to the Greek proverb, "at first for his fair cheeks and comely beard the beast is taken for a lion, but at last he is turned to a dragon, or a leopard, or a swine:" that which is at first beauty on the face, may prove lust in the manners; so Eubulus wittily reprehended such impure contracts; they offer in their marital sacrifices nothing but the thigh, and that which the priests cut from the goats when they were laid to bleed upon the altars. "He or she that looks too curiously on the beauty of the body, looks too low, and hath flesh and corruption in his heart, and is judged sensual and earthly in his affections and desires." Begin, therefore, with God; Christ is the president of marriage, and the Holy Ghost is the fountain of purities and chaste loves, and He joins the hearts; and therefore let our first suit be in the court of heaven, and with designs of piety, or safety, or charity; let no impure spirit defile the virgin purities and "castifications of the soul," as St Peter's phrase is; let all such contracts begin with religious affections. "We sometimes beg of God for a wife or a child; and He alone knows what the wife shall prove, and by what dispositions and manners, and into what fortune that child shall enter;" but we shall not need to fear concerning the event of it, if religion, and fair intentions, and prudence, manage and conduct it all the way. The preservation of a family, the production of children, the avoiding fornication, the refreshment of our sorrows by the comforts of society; all these are fair ends of marriage and hallow the entrance: but in these there is a special order; society was the first designed, "It is not good for man to be alone;" children was the next, "Increase and multiply;" but the avoiding fornication came in by the superfœtation of the evil accidents of the world. The first makes marriage delectable, the second necessary to the public, the third necessary to the particular. This is for safety, for life, and Heaven itself, the other have in them joy and a portion of immortality. The first makes the man's heart glad; the second is the friend of kingdoms, and cities, and families; and the third is the enemy to hell, and an antidote of the chiefest inlet to damnation. But of all these the noblest end is the multiplying of children. "It is religion," said Varro, "to marry for children." And therefore St Ignatius, when he had spoken of Elias, and Titus, and Clement, with an honourable mention of their virgin state, lest he might seem to have lessened the married apostles, at whose feet in Christ's kingdom he thought himself unworthy to sit, he gives this testimony; they were secured "by not marrying to satisfy their lower appetites, but out of desire of children." Other considerations, if they be incident and by way of appendage, are also considerable in the accounts of prudence; but when they become principals, they defile the mystery, and make the blessing doubtful. "Love is a fair inducement," said Afranius, "but desire and appetite are rude, and the characterisms of a sensual person; to love belongs to a just and a good man, but to lust, or furiously and passionately to desire, is the sign of impotency and an unruly mind."

2. Man and wife are equally concerned to avoid all offences of each other in the beginning of their conversation: every little thing can blast an infant blossom; and the breath of the south can shake the little rings of the vine when first they begin to curl like the locks of a new-weaned boy; but when by age and consolidation they stiffen into the hardness of a stem, and have by the warm embraces of the sun and the kisses of heaven brought forth their clusters, they can endure the storms of the north and the loud noises of a tempest, and yet never be broken; so are the early unions of an unfixed marriage; watchful and observant, jealous and busy, inquisitive and careful, and apt to take alarm at every unkind word. For infirmities do not manifest themselves in the first scenes, but in the succession of a long society; and it is not chance or weakness when it appears at first, but it is want of love or prudence, or it will be so expounded; and that which appears ill at first usually affrights the inexperienced man or woman, who makes unequal conjectures, and fancies mighty sorrows by the proportions of the new and early unkindness. It is a very great passion, or a huge folly, or a certain want of love, that cannot preserve the colours and beauties of kindness so long as public honesty requires man to wear their sorrows for the death of a friend. Plutarch compares a new marriage to a vessel before the hoops are on: "everything dissolves their tender compaginations;" but "when the joints are stiffened and are tied by a firm compliance and proportioned bending, scarcely can it be dissolved without fire or the violence of iron." After the hearts of the man and the wife are endeared and hardened by a mutual confidence, and an experience longer than artifice and pretence can last, there are a great many remembrances, and some things present, that dash all little unkindnesses in pieces. The little boy in the Greek epigram that was creeping down a precipice, was invited to his safety by the sight of his mother's pap when nothing else could entice him to return; and the

bond of common children, and the sight of her that nurses what is most dear to him, and the endearments of each other in the course of a long society, and the same relation, is an excellent security to redintegrate and to call that love back which folly and trifling accidents would disturb. When it is come thus far, it is hard untwisting the knot; but be careful in its first coalition that there be no rudeness done, for if there be, it will for ever after be apt to start and to be diseased.

3. Let man and wife be careful to stifle little things, that as fast as they spring they be cut down and trod on; for if they be suffered to grow by numbers, they make the spirit peevish, and the society troublesome, and the affections loose and easy by an habitual aversation. Some men are more vexed with a fly than with a wound; and when the gnats disturb our sleep, and the reason is disquieted, but not perfectly awakened, it is often seen that he is fuller of trouble than if in the daylight of his reason he were to contest with a potent enemy. In the frequent little accidents of a family, a man's reason cannot always be awake; and when his discourses are imperfect, and a trifling trouble makes him yet more restless, he is soon betrayed to the violence of passion. It is certain that the man or woman are in a state of weakness and folly then when they can be troubled with a trifling accident, and therefore it is not good to tempt their affections when they are in that state of danger. In this case, the caution is to subtract fuel from the sudden flame; for stubble, though it be quickly kindled, yet it is as soon extinguished if it be not blown by a pertinacious breath, or fed with new materials. Add no new provocations to the accident, and do not inflame this, and peace will soon return, and the discontent will pass away soon as the sparks from the collision of a flint: ever remembering that discontents proceeding from daily little things do breed a secret undiscernible disease which is more dangerous than a fever proceeding from a discerned notorious surfeit.

4. Let them be sure to abstain from all those things which by experience and observation they find to be contrary to each other. They that govern elephants never appear before them in white, and the masters of bulls keep from them all garments of blood and scarlet, as knowing that they will be impatient of civil usages and discipline when their natures are provoked by their proper antipathies. The ancients in their marital hieroglyphics used to depict Mercury standing by Venus, to signify that by fair language and sweet entreaties the minds of each other should be united; and hard by them *Suadam et Gratias descripserunt*, they would have all deliciousness of manners, compliance and mutual observance to abide.

5. Let the husband and wife infinitely avoid a curious distinction of mine and thine, for this hath caused all the laws, and all the suits, and all the wars in the world; let them who have but one person have also but one interest. The husband and wife are heirs to each other, as Dionysius Halicarnasseus relates from Romulus, if they die without children; but if there be children, the wife is τοῖς παισὶν ἰσόμοιρος, "a partner in the inheritance;" but during their life the use and employment is common to both their necessities, and in this there is no other difference of right but that the man hath the dispensation of all, and may keep it from his wife, just as the governor of a town may keep it from the right owner—he hath the power, but no right to do so. And when either of them begins to impropriate, it is like a tumour in the flesh, it draws more than its share, but what it feeds on turns to a boil. And therefore the Romans forbade any donations to be made between man and wife, because neither of them could transfer a new right of those things which already they had in common; but this is to be understood only concerning the uses of necessity and personal conveniences, for so all may be the woman's and all may be the man's, in several regards. Corvinus dwells in a farm and receives all its profits, and reaps and sows as he pleases, and eats of the corn and drinks of the wine; it is his own, but all that also is his lord's, and for it Corvinus pays acknowledgment, and his patron hath such powers and uses of it as are proper to the lords; and yet for all this it may be the king's too, to all the purposes that he can need, and is all to be accounted in the *census*, and for certain services and times of danger; so are the riches of a family, they are a woman's as well as a man's; they are hers for need, and hers for ornament, and hers for modest delight, and for the uses of religion and prudent charity; but the disposing them into portions of inheritance, the assignation of charges and governments, stipends and rewards, annuities and greater donatives, are the reserves of the superior right, and not to be invaded by the under-possessors. But in those things where they ought to be common, if the spleen or the belly swells, and draws into its capacity much of that which should be spent on those parts which have an equal right to be maintained, it is a dropsy or a consumption of the whole, something that is evil because it is unnatural and monstrous. Macarius, in his thirty-second homily, speaks fully in this particular; a woman betrothed to a man bears all her portion, and with a mighty love pours it into the hands of her husband, and says, "I have nothing of my own;" my goods, my portion, my body, and my mind are yours. "All that a woman hath is reckoned to the right of her husband; not her wealth and her person only, but her reputation and her praise;" so Lucian. But as the earth, the mother of all creatures here below, sends up all its vapours and proper emissions at the command of the sun, and yet requires them

again to refresh her own needs, and they are deposited between them both in the bosom of a cloud as a common receptacle, that they may cool his flames, and yet descend to make her fruitful, so are the proprieties of a wife to be disposed of by her lord, and yet all are for her provisions, it being a part of his need to refresh and supply hers, and it serves the interest of both, while it serves the necessities of either.

These are the duties of them both, which have common regards and equal necessities and obligations. And indeed there is scarce any matter of duty but it concerns them both alike, and is only distinguished by names, and hath its variety by circumstances and little accidents; and what in one is called "love," in the other is called "reverence," and what in the wife is "obedience," the same in the man is "duty;" he provides, and she dispenses; he gives commandments, and she rules by them; he rules her by authority, and she rules him by love; she ought by all means to please him, and he must by no means displease her. For as the heart is set in the midst of the body, and though it strikes to one side by the prerogative of nature, yet those throbs and constant motions are felt on the other side also, and the influence is equal to both, so it is in conjugal duties; some motions are to the one side more than to the other, but the interest is on both, and the duty is equal in the several instances. If it be otherwise, the man enjoys a wife as Periander did his dead Melissa, by an unnatural union, neither pleasing nor holy, useless to all the purposes of society, and dead to content.

PART II.

The next inquiry is more particular, and considers the power and duty of the man; "let every one of you so love his wife even as himself;" she is as himself, the man hath power over her as over himself, and must love her equally.

1. A husband's power over his wife is paternal and friendly, not magisterial and despotic. The wife is in *perpetua tutela*, under conduct and counsel; for the power a man hath is founded in the understanding, not in the will or force; it is not a power of coercion, but a power of advice, and that government that wise men have over those who are fit to be conducted by them: said Valerius in Livy, "husbands should rather be fathers than lords." Homer adds more soft appellatives to the character of a husband's duty: "Thou art to be a father and a mother to her, and a brother," and great reason, unless the state of marriage should be no better than the condition of an orphan. For she that is bound to leave father, and mother, and brother for thee, either is miserable like a poor fatherless child, or else ought to find all these, and more, in thee. Medea in Euripides had cause to complain when she found it otherwise, which St Ambrose well translates: "It is sad, when virgins are with their own money sold to slavery; and that services are in better state than marriages, for they receive wages, but these buy their fetters, and pay dear for their loss of liberty;" and therefore the Romans expressed the man's power over his wife but by a gentle word. Cicero said, "Let there be no governor of the woman appointed, but a censor of manners, one to teach the men to moderate their wives," that is, fairly to induce them to the measures of their own proportions. It was rarely observed of Philo, "When Adam made that fond excuse for his folly in eating the forbidden fruit, he said, 'The woman thou gavest to be *with* me, she gave me.' He says, not 'the woman which Thou gavest *to* me,' no such thing; she is none of his goods, none of his possessions, not to be reckoned amongst his servants; God did not give her to him so; but 'the woman Thou gavest to be with me,' that is, to be my partner, the companion of my joys and sorrows, thou gavest her for use, not for dominion." The dominion of a man over his wife is no other than as the soul rules the body, for which it takes a mighty care, and uses it with a delicate tenderness, and cares for it in all contingencies, and watches to keep it from all evils, and studies to make for it fair provisions, and very often is led by its inclinations and desires, and does never contradict its appetites, but when they are evil, and then also not without some trouble and sorrow; and its government comes only to this, it furnishes the body with light and understanding, and the body furnishes the soul with hands and feet; the soul governs, because the body cannot else be happy, but the government is no other than provision; as a nurse governs a child, when she causes him to eat, and to be warm, and dry, and quiet; and yet even the very government itself is divided; for man and wife in the family are as the sun and moon in the firmament of heaven; he rules by day, and she by night, that is, in the lesser and more proper circles of her affairs, in the conduct of domestic provisions and necessary offices, and shines only by his light, and rules by his authority; and as the moon in opposition to the sun shines brightest, that is, then, when she is in her own circles and separate regions; so is the authority of the wife then most conspicuous when she is separate and in her proper sphere, *in gynæceo*, in the nursery and offices of domestic employment; but when she is in conjunction with the sun her brother, that is, in that place and employment in which his care and proper offices are employed, her light is not seen, her authority hath no proper business; but else there is no difference, for they were barbarous people, among whom wives were instead of servants, said Spartianus in Caracalla; and it is a sign of impotency and weakness, to force the camels to kneel for their load, because thou hast not spirit and strength enough to climb, to make the affections and evenness of a

wife bend by the flexures of a servant, is a sign the man is not wise enough to govern, when another stands by. So many differences as can be in the appellatives of *dominus* and *domina*, governor and governess, lord and lady, master and mistress, the same difference there is in the authority of man and woman, and no more; *Si tu Caius, ego Caia*, was publicly proclaimed on the threshold of the young man's house, when the bride entered into his hands and power; and the title of *domina* in the sense of the civil law, was among the Romans given to wives, said Virgil, where, though Servius says it was spoken after the manner of the Greeks, who called the wife Δέσποιναν, "lady" or "mistress," yet it was so amongst both the nations. "*Ac domus, dominam voca*," says Catullus; "*Hærebit dominæ vir comes ipse suæ*," so Martial; and, therefore, although there is just measure of subjection * and obedience due from the wife to the husband (as I shall after explain), yet nothing of this is expressed in the man's character, or in his duty; he is not commanded to rule, nor instructed how, nor bidden to exact obedience, or to defend his privilege; all his duty is signified by love, "by nourishing and cherishing," by being joined with her in all the unions of charity, by "not being bitter to her," by "dwelling with her according to knowledge, giving honour to her," so that it seems to be with husbands, as it is with bishops and priests, to whom much honour is due; but yet so that if they stand on it, and challenge it, they become less honourable; and as amongst men and women, humility is the way to be preferred; so it is in husbands, they shall prevail by cession, by sweetness and counsel, and charity and compliance. So that we cannot discourse of the man's right, without describing the measures of his duty; that therefore follows next.

2. "Let him love his wife even as himself;" that is his duty, and the measure of it too; which is so plain, that if he understands how he treats himself, there needs nothing be added concerning his demeanour towards her, save only that we add the particulars, in which Holy Scripture instances this general commandment.

Μὴ πικραίνετε. That is the first. "Be not bitter against her;" and this is the least index and signification of love. A civil man is never bitter against a friend or a stranger, much less to him that enters under his roof, and is secured by the laws of hospitality. But a wife does all that and more; she quits all her interest for his love, she gives him all that she can give, she is as much the same person as another can be the same, who is conjoined by love, and mystery, and religion, and all that is sacred and profane. They have the same fortune, the same family, the same children, the same religion, the same interest, "the same flesh," *erant duo in carnem unam;* and therefore this the apostle urges for his μὴ πικραίνετε, "no man hateth his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it;" and he certainly is strangely sacrilegious and a violator of the rights of hospitality and sanctuary, who uses her rudely, who is fled for protection, not only to his house, but also to his heart and bosom. A wise man will not wrangle with any one, much less with his dearest relative; and if it is accounted indecent to embrace in public, it is extremely shameful to brawl in public, for the other is in itself lawful; but this never, though it were assisted with the best circumstances of which it is capable. Marcus Aurelius said, that "a wise man ought often to admonish his wife, to reprove her seldom, but never to lay his hands on her." And the ancients use to sacrifice to Juno, or "the president of marriage," without gall; and St Basil observes and urges it by way of upbraiding quarrelling husbands, "the viper casts all his poison when he marries his female." He is worse than a viper, who, for the reverence of this sacred union, will not abstain from such a poisonous bitterness; and how shall he embrace that person whom he hath smitten reproachfully? for those kindnesses are indecent which the fighting man pays unto his wife. St Chrysostom, preaching earnestly against this barbarous inhumanity of striking the wife, or reviling her with evil language, says, it is as if a king should beat his viceroy and use him like a dog, from whom most of that reverence and majesty must needs depart, which he first put on him, and the subjects shall pay him less duty, how much his prince hath treated him with less civility; but the loss redounds to himself, and the government of the whole family shall be disordered, if blows be laid on that shoulder which, together with the other, ought to bear nothing but the cares and the issues of a prudent government. And it is observable, that no man ever did this rudeness with a virtuous end; it is an incompetent instrument, and may proceed from wrath and folly, but can never end in virtue and the unions of a prudent and fair society. "If you strike," saith St Chrysostom, "you exasperate the wound," and (like Cato at Utica in his despair) tear the wounds in pieces; and yet he that did so ill to himself whom he loved well, he loved not women tenderly, and yet would never strike; and if the man cannot endure her talking, how can she endure his striking? But this caution contains a duty in it which none prevaricates, but the meanest of the people, fools, and bedlams, whose kindness is a curse, whose government is by chance and violence, and their families are herds of talking cattle.

The marital love is infinitely removed from all possibility of such rudeness: it is a thing pure

* "St Paul to the Colossians, chap. iii., verse 18, first adviseth women to submit themselves to their husbands, and then counselleth men to love their wives. And sure it was fitting that women should first have this lesson given them, because it is hardest to be learned, and therefore they need have the more time to con it."—*Fuller's Holy State.*

as light, sacred as a temple, lasting as the world. "That love," said one, "that can cease, was never true:" it is ὁμιλία, so Moses called it; it is εὔνοια, so St Paul; it is φιλότης, so Homer; it is φιλοφροσύνη, so Plutarch: that is, it contains in it all "sweetness," and all "society," and "felicity," and all "prudence," and all "wisdom." For there is nothing can please a man without love; and if a man be weary of the wise discourses of the apostles, and of the innocency of an even and a private fortune, or hates peace or a fruitful year, he hath reaped thorns and thistles from the choicest flowers of paradise; "for nothing can sweeten felicity itself but love:" but when a man dwells in love, then the breasts of his wife are pleasant as the droppings on the hill of Hermon, her eyes are fair as the light of heaven, she is a fountain sealed, and he can quench his thirst, and ease his cares, and lay his sorrow down on her lap, and can retire home to his sanctuary and refectory, and his garden of sweetness and chaste refreshments. No man can tell but he that loves his children, how many delicious accents make a man's heart dance in the pretty conversation of those dear pledges; their childishness, their stammering, their little angers, their innocence, their imperfections, their necessities, are so many little emanations of joy and comfort to him that delights in their persons and society; but he that loves not his wife and children feeds a lioness at home, and broods a nest of sorrows; and blessing itself cannot make him happy: so that all the commandments of God enjoining a man to "love his wife," are nothing but so many necessities and capacities of joy. "She that is loved is safe; and he that loves is joyful." Love is a union of all things excellent; it contains in it proportion and satisfaction, and rest and confidence; and I wish that this were so much proceeded in that the heathens themselves could not go beyond us in this virtue, and its proper and its appendant happiness. Tiberius Gracchus chose to die for the safety of his wife; and yet, methinks, for a Christian to do so should be no hard thing; for many servants will die for their masters, and many gentlemen will die for their friend; but the examples are not so many of those that are ready to do it for their dearest relatives, and yet some there have been. Baptista Fregosa tells of a Neapolitan that gave himself a slave to the Moors, that he might follow his wife; and Dominicus Catalusius, the prince of Lesbos, kept company with his lady when she was a leper; and these are greater things than to die.

But the cases in which this can be required are so rare and contingent, that Holy Scripture instances not the duty in this particular; but it contains in it that the husband should nourish and cherish her, that he should refresh her sorrows and entice her fears into confidence and pretty arts of rest; for even the fig-trees that grew in paradise had sharp-pointed leaves, harshnesses fit to mortify the too-forward lusting after the sweetness of the fruit. But it will concern the prudence of the husband's love to make the cares and evils as simple and easy as he can, by doubling the joys and acts of a careful friendship, by tolerating her infirmities (because by so doing he either cures her or makes himself better), by fairly expounding all the little traverses of society and communication, "by taking everything by the right handle," as Plutarch's expression is; for there is nothing but may be misinterpreted, and yet if it be capable of a fair construction, it is the office of love to make it. Love will account that to be well said, which, it may be, was not so intended; and then it may cause it to be so another time.

3. Hither also is to be referred that he secure the interest of her virtue and felicity by a fair example; for a wife to a husband is a line or superficies; it hath dimensions of its own, but no motion or proper affections; but commonly puts on such images of virtues or vices as are presented to her by her husband's idea; and if thou beest vicious, complain not that she is infected that lies in thy bosom; the interest of whose love ties her to transcribe thy copy, and write after the characters of thy manners. Paris was a man of pleasure, and Helena was an adulteress, and she added covetousness on her own account. But Ulysses was a prudent man, and a wary counsellor, sober and severe; and he efformed his wife into such imagery as he desired; and she was chaste as the snows on the mountains, diligent as the fatal sisters, always busy, and always faithful: "she had a lazy tongue, and a busy hand."

4. Above all the instances of love, let him preserve towards her an inviolable faith, and an unspotted chastity; for this is the marriage-ring; it ties two hearts by an eternal band; it is like the cherubim's flaming sword, set for the guard of paradise; he that passes into that garden, now that it is immured by Christ and the Church, enters into the shades of death. No man must touch the forbidden tree, that in the midst of the garden, which is the tree of knowledge and life. Chastity is the security of love, and preserves all the mysteriousness like the secrets of a temple. Under this lock is deposited security of families, the union of affections, the repairer of accidental breaches. This is a grace that is shut up and secured by all arts of heaven, and the defence of laws, the locks and bars of modesty, by honour and reputation, by fear and shame, by interest and high regards; and that contract that is intended to be for ever is yet dissolved, and broken by the violation of this; nothing but death can do so much evil to the holy rites of marriage as unchastity and breach of faith can. The shepherd Cratis falling in love with a she goat, had his brains beaten out with a buck as he lay asleep; and by the laws of the

Romans, a man might kill his daughter or his wife, if he surprised her in the breach of her holy vows, which are as sacred as the threads of life, secret as the privacies of the sanctuary, and holy as the society of angels; and God that commanded us to forgive our enemies, left it in our choice, and hath not commanded us to forgive an adulterous husband or a wife; but the offended party's displeasure may pass into an eternal separation of society and friendship. Now in this grace it is fit that the wisdom and severity of the man should hold forth a pure taper, that his wife may, by seeing the beauties and transparencies of that crystal, dress her mind and her body by the light of so pure reflections; it is certain he will expect it from the modesty and retirement, from the passive nature and colder temper, from the humility and fear, from the honour and love, of his wife, that she be pure as the eye of heaven; and therefore it is but reason that the wisdom and nobleness, the love and confidence, the strength and severity, of the man, should be as holy and certain in this grace, as he is a severe exactor of it at her hands, who can more easily be tempted by another, and less by herself.

These are the little lines of a man's duty, which, like threads of light from the body of the sun, do clearly describe all the regions of his proper obligations. Now concerning the woman's duty, although it consists in doing whatsoever her husband commands, and so receives measures from the rules of his government, yet there are also some lines of life depicted on her hands, by which she may read and know how to proportion out her duty to her husband.

1. The first is obedience; which, because it is nowhere enjoined that the man should exact of her, but often commanded to her to pay, gives demonstration that it is a voluntary cession that is required—such a cession as must be without coercion and violence on his part, but on fair inducements and reasonableness in the thing, and out of love and honour on her part. When God commands us to love Him, He means we should obey Him,—"This is love, that ye keep my commandments;" and "If ye love me," said our Lord, "keep my commandments." Now as Christ is to the Church, so is man to the wife, and therefore obedience is the best instance of her love, for it proclaims her submission, her humility, her opinion of his wisdom, his preeminence in the family, the right of his privilege, and the injunction imposed by God on her sex, that although in sorrow she bring forth children, yet with love and choice she should obey. The man's authority is love, and the woman's love is obedience; and it was not rightly observed of him that said, when the woman fell, "God made her timorous that she might be ruled," apt and easy to obey, for this obedience is no way founded in fear, but in love and reverence: *receptæ reverentiæ est si mulier viro subsit*, said the law. Unless also that we will add that it is an effect of that modesty which like rubies adorns the necks and cheeks of women. Said the maiden in the comedy, "It is modesty to advance and highly to honour them, who have honoured us by making us to be the companions" of their dearest excellences. For the woman that went before the man in the way of death is commanded to follow him in the way of love; and that makes the society to be perfect, and the union profitable, and the harmony complete. For then the soul and body make a perfect man, when the soul commands wisely, or rules lovingly, and cares profitably, and provides plentifully, and conducts charitably that body which is its partner, and yet the inferior. But if the body shall give laws, and by the violence of the appetite first abuse the understanding, and then possess the superior portion of the will and choice, the body and the soul are not apt company, and the man is a fool, and miserable. If the soul rules not, it cannot be a companion; either it must govern or be a slave. Never was king deposed and suffered to live in the state of peerage and equal honour, but made a prisoner or put to death; and those women that had rather lead the blind than follow prudent guides, rule fools and easy men than obey the powerful and wise, never made a good society in a house. A wife never can become equal but by obeying, but so her power, while it is in minority, makes up the authority of the man integral, and becomes one government as themselves are one man. "Male and female created He them, and called their name Adam," saith the Holy Scripture; they are but one, and therefore the several parts of this one man must stand in the place where God appointed, that the lower parts may do their offices in their own station, and promote the common interest of the whole. A ruling woman is intolerable. It is a sad calamity for a woman to be joined to a fool or a weak person; it is like a guard of geese to keep the Capitol; or as if a flock of sheep should read grave lectures to their shepherd, and give him orders where he shall conduct them to pasture. . . . "To be ruled by weaker people," "to have a fool to one's master," is the fate of miserable and unblessed people: and the wife can be no ways happy, unless she be governed by a prudent lord, whose commands are sober counsels, whose authority is paternal, whose orders are provisions, and whose sentences are charity.

For although in those things which are of the necessary parts of faith and holy life the woman is only subject to Christ, who only is and can be Lord of consciences, and commands alone where the conscience is instructed and convinced, yet, as it is part of the man's office to be a teacher and a prophet, and a guide and a master, so also it will relate very much to the demonstration of their affections to obey his counsels, to imitate his virtues, to be directed by his wisdom, to have

her persuasion measured by the lines of his excellent religion. "It were hugely decent," saith Plutarch, "that the wife should acknowledge her husband for her teacher and her guide," for then when she is what he please to efform her, he hath no cause to complain if she be no better. "His precepts and wise counsels can draw her off from vanities;" and as he said of geometry, that if she be skilled in that she will not easily be a gamester or a dancer, may perfectly be said of religion; if she suffers herself to be guided by his counsel and efformed by his religion, either he is an ill master in his religion, or he may secure in her, and for his advantage, an excellent virtue. And although in matters of religion the husband hath no empire and command, yet if there be a place left to persuade, and entreat, and induce by arguments, there is not in a family a greater endearment of affections than the unity of religion, and anciently it was not permitted to a woman to have a religion by herself, and the rites which a woman performs severally from her husband are not pleasing to God, and therefore Pomponia Græcina, because she entertained a stranger religion, was permitted to the judgment of her husband Plantius. And this whole affair is no stranger to Christianity, for the Christian woman was not suffered to marry an unbelieving man; and although this is not to be extended to different opinions within the limits of the common faith, yet thus much advantage is won or lost by it, that the compliance of the wife, and submission of her understanding to the better rule of her husband in matters of religion, will help very much to warrant her though she should be mispersuaded in a matter less necessary, yet nothing can warrant her in her separate rites and manners of worshippings but an invincible necessity of conscience and a curious infallible truth; and if she be deceived alone, she hath no excuse, if with him, she hath much pity, and some degrees of warranty under the protection of humility, and duty, and dear affections. And she will find that it is part of her privilege and right to partake of the mysteries and blessings of her husband's religion. "A woman," said Romulus, "by the holy laws hath right to partake of her husband's goods, and her husband's sacrifices and holy things." Where there is a schism in one bed, there is a nursery of temptations, and love is persecuted and in perpetual danger to be destroyed; there dwell jealousies, and divided interests, and differing opinions, and continual disputes, and we cannot love them so well whom we believe to be less beloved of God, and it is ill uniting with a person concerning whom my persuasion tells me that he is like to live in hell to eternal ages.

2. The next line of the woman's duty is compliance, which St Peter calls, "the hidden man of the heart, the ornament of a meek and a quiet spirit," and to it he opposes the outward and pompous ornament of the body, concerning which as there can be no particular measure set down to all persons, but the proportions were to be measured by the customs of wise people, the quality of the woman, and the desires of the man; yet it is to be limited by Christian modesty, and the usages of the more excellent and severe matrons. Menander in the comedy brings in a man turning his wife from his house because she stained her yellow hair, which was then the beauty. A wise woman should not paint. A studious gallantry in clothes cannot make a wise man love his wife the better. Said the comedy: "Such gaieties are fit for tragedies, but not for the uses of life;" *decor occultus et tecta venustas*, that's the Christian woman's fineness; "the hidden man of the heart," sweetness of manners, humble comportment, fair interpretation of all addresses, ready compliance, high opinion of him and mean of herself, "to partake secretly, and in her heart of all his joys and sorrows," to believe him comely and fair though the sun hath drawn a cypress over him; for as marriages are not to be contracted by the hands and eye, but with reason and the hearts, so are these judgments to be made by the mind, not by the sight; and diamonds cannot make the woman virtuous, nor him to value her who sees her put them off then, when charity and modesty are her brightest ornaments. . . . Indeed, the outward ornament is fit to take fools, but they are not worth the taking; but she that hath a wise husband must entice him to an eternal dearness by the veil of modesty and the grave robes of chastity, the ornament of meekness and the jewels of faith and charity; she must have no *fucus* but blushings, her brightness must be purity, and she must shine round about with sweetness and friendship, and she shall be pleasant while she lives, and desired when she dies. If not, her grave shall be full of rottenness and dishonour, and her memory shall be worse after she is dead. After she is dead; for that will be the end of all merry meetings; and I choose this to be the last advice to both:

3. "Remember the days of darkness, for they are many;" the joys of the bridal-chamber are quickly past, and the remaining portion of the state is a dull progress, without variety of joys, but not without the change of sorrows; but that portion that shall enter into the grave must be eternal. It is fit that I should infuse a bunch of myrrh into the festival goblet, and after the Egyptian manner serve up a dead man's bones at a feast: I will only show it and take it away again; it will make the wine bitter, but wholesome. But those married pairs that live as remembering that they must part again, and give an account how they treat themselves and each other, shall at the day of their death be admitted to glorious espousals, and when they shall live again be married to their Lord, and partake of His glories, with Abraham and Joseph, St Peter and St Paul, and all the married saints. "All

those things that now please us shall pass from us, or we from them;" but those things that concern the other life are permanent as the numbers of eternity; and although at the resurrection there shall be no relation of husband and wife, and no marriage shall be celebrated but the marriage of the Lamb; yet then shall be remembered how men and women passed through this state which is a type of that, and from this sacramental union all holy pairs shall pass to the spiritual and eternal, where love shall be their portion, and joys shall crown their heads, and they shall lie in the bosom of Jesus and in the heart of God to eternal ages. Amen.

ROBERT LEIGHTON.*

1613-1684.

DIVINE GRACE AND HOLY OBEDIENCE.†

To desire ease and happiness, under a general representation of it, is a thing of more easy and general persuasion; there is somewhat in nature to help the argument. But to find beauty in, and be taken with, the very way of holiness that leads to it, is more rare, and depends on a higher principle. Self love inclines a man to desire the rest of love, but to love and desire the labour of love is love of a higher and purer strain. To delight and be cheerful in obedience argues much love as the spring of it. That is the thing the holy Psalmist doth so plentifully express in this Psalm, and he is still desiring more of that sweet and lively affection that might make him yet more abundant in action. Thus here, "I will run," etc., he presents his desire and his purpose together, *q.d.*, The more of this grace Thou bestowest on me, the more service shall I be able to do Thee.

This is the top of his ambition, while others are seeking to enlarge their barns, their lands or estates, or their titles; and kings to enlarge their territories or authority, to encroach on neighbouring kingdoms, or be more absolute in their own; instead of all such enlargements this is David's great desire, an "enlarged heart to run the way of God's commandments."

And these other (how big soever they sound) are poor narrow desires: this one is larger and higher than them all, and gives evidence of a heart already large. But as it is miserable in those desires, so it is happy in this, that much would still have more.

Let others seek more money, or more honour. Oh! the blessed choice of that soul that is still seeking more love to God, more affection, and more ability to do Him service; that counts all days and hours for lost which are not employed to their improvement; that hears the Word in public, and reads it in private for this purpose, to kindle this love, or to blow the spark, if any there be already in the heart, to raise it to a clear flame, and from a little flame to make it burn yet hotter and purer, and rise higher; but, above all means, is often presenting *this* in prayer to Him on whose influence all depends, in whose hand our hearts are, much more than in our own. It follows Him with this desire, and works on Him by His own interest. Though there can be really no accession of gain to Him by our services, yet He is pleased to account with us as if there were. Therefore we may urge this: Lord, give more, and receive more. "I will run the way of Thy commandments, when Thou shalt enlarge my heart."

We have here, in these words, a required disposition, and a suitable resolution. The disposition relates to the resolution, as the means of fulfilling it; and the resolution relates to the disposition, both as the end of desiring it, and as the motive of obtaining it. The resolution occurs first in the words

"I will run," etc. The way resolved on, that of God's commandments, not the road of the polluted world, not the crooked ways of his own heart, but the highway, the royal way, the straight way of the kingdom, and that in the notion of subjection and obedience, "the way of Thy commandments." This, man naturally struggles against and repines at. To be limited and bounded by a law is a restraint, and vain man could possibly find in his heart to do many

---

* "His preaching had a sublimity both of thought and expression in it. The grace and gravity of his pronunciation was such that few heard him without a very sensible emotion; I am sure I never did. His style was rather too fine; but there was a majesty and a beauty in it that left so deep an impression, that I cannot yet forget the sermons I heard him preach thirty years ago."—*Bishop Burnet.*

"The manner of his delivery added much to the effect of Leighton's discourses. His voice was feeble, but clear, flexible, and melodious. His pronunciation was deliberate and rather slow, yet distinct, warm, and pathetic. His attitude and his gesture were highly graceful. He showed and he excited sensibility. His manner arrested attention: a wandering eye was never seen when he preached, and the audience were frequently dissolved in tears, while himself was visibly and deeply affected. His oratory [was] pure, soft, and insinuating; it resembled the flakes of falling snow."—*Dr Jerment.*

† "I will run the way of Thy commandments when Thou shalt enlarge my heart" (Psalm cxix. 32).

of the same things that are commanded, but he would not be tied, would have his liberty, and do it of his own choice. This is the enmity of the carnal mind against God, as the Apostle expresses it; "It is not subject to the law of God, neither can it be;" it breaks these bonds, and casts away the cords of His authority. This is sin, the transgression of the law; and this made the first sin so great, though in a matter one would think small, the eating of the fruit of a tree: it was rebellion against the majesty of God, casting off His law and authority, and aspiring to an imagined self-deity. And this is still the treasonable pride or independency, and wickedness of our nature, rising up against God who formed us of nothing.

And this is the power and substance of religion, the new impress of God upon the heart, obedience and resignment to Him. To be given up to Him as entirely His, to be moulded and ordered as He will, to be subject to His laws and appointments in all things, to have every action and every word under a rule and law, and the penalty to be so high—eternal death. All this, to a carnal or haughty mind, is hard. Not only every action and every word, but even every thought too, must be subject. The soul is not so much as thought free. "Every thought is brought into captivity," as the apostle speaks, 2 Cor. x. 5; and so the licentious mind accounts it. Not only the affections and desires, but the very reasonings and imaginations are brought under this law.

Now, to yield this as reasonable and due to God, to own His sovereignty, and to acknowledge the law to be holy, just, and good; to approve, yea, to love it, even when it most contradicts and controls our own corrupt will and the law of sin in our flesh; this is true spiritual obedience—to study and inquire after the will of God in all our ways what will please Him, and, having found it, to follow that which is here called "the way of His commandments;" to make this our way, and our business in the world, and all other things but accessories and by-works, even those lawful things that may be taken in and used as helps in our way, as the disciples passing through the corn, plucked the ears, and did eat in passing as a by-work, but their business was to follow their Master. And whatsoever would hinder us in this way must be watched and guarded against. To effect that, we must either remove and thrust it aside, or, if we cannot do that, yet we must go over it, and trample it under foot, were it the thing or the person, that is dearest to us in the world. Till the heart be brought to this state and purpose, it is either wholly void of, or very low and weak in the truth of religion.

We place religion much in our accustomed performances, in coming to church, hearing and repeating of sermons, and praying at home, keeping a road of such and such duties. The "way of God's commandments" is more in doing than in discourse. In many, religion evaporates itself too much out by the tongue, while it appears too little in their "ways." Oh, but this is the main, one act of charity, meekness or humility, speaks more than a day's discourse. All the means we use in religion are intended for a further end, which, if they attain not, they are nothing. This end is, to mortify and purify the heart, to mould it to the way of God's commandments in the whole track of our lives; in our private converse one with another, and our retired secret converse with ourselves, to have God still before us, and His law our rule in all we do, that He may be our meditation day and night, and that His law may be our counsellor, as this psalm hath it; to regulate all our designs and the works of our callings by it; to walk "soberly, and godly, and righteously in this present world;" to curb and cross our own wills where they cross God's; to deny ourselves our own humour and pride, our passions and pleasures; to have all these subdued and brought under by the power of the law of love within us—this, and nothing below this, is the end of religion. Alas! amongst multitudes who are called Christians, some there may be who speak and appear like it, yet how few are there who make this their business, and aspire to this, "the way of God's commandments."

His intended course in this way, the Psalmist expresses by "running." It is good to be in this way even in the slowest motions. Love will creep where it cannot go. But if thou art so indeed, then thou wilt long for a swifter motion. If thou do but creep, be doing, creep on, yet desire to be enabled to go. If thou goest, but yet halting and lamely, desire to be strengthened to walk straight; and if thou walkest, let not that satisfy thee, desire to run. So here, David did walk in this way, but he earnestly wishes to mend his pace; he would willingly run, and for that end he desires an enlarged heart.

Some dispute and discant too much, whether they go or not, and childishly tell their steps, and would know at every pace whether they advance or not, and how much they advance, and thus amuse themselves, and spend the time of doing and going, in questioning and doubting. Thus it is with many Christians. But it were a more wise and comfortable way, to be endeavouring onwards, and, if thou make little progress, at least to be desiring to make more; to be praying and walking, and praying that thou mayest walk faster, and that in the end thou mayest run; not to be satisfied without anything attained, but yet, by that unsatisfiedness, not to be so dejected as to sit down or stand still, but rather excited to go on. So it was with St. Paul, Phil. iii. 13, "Forgetting the things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press forward." If any one thinks that he hath done well and run far, and

will take a pause, the great apostle is of another mind: "Not as if I had already attained." Oh, no! far from that, he still sets forward, as if nothing were done; like a runner, not still looking back to see how much he hath run, but forward to what he is to run, stretching forth to that, inflamed with frequent looks at the mark and end. Some are retarded by looking on what is past as not satisfied; they have done nothing, as they think, and so stand still discontented. But, even in that way, it is not good to look too much to things behind; we must forget them rather, and press onward.

Some, if they have gone on well, and possibly run for a while, yet, if they fall, then they are ready in a desperate malcontent to lie still, and think all is lost; and, in this peevish fretting at their falls, some men please themselves, and take it for repentance, whereas indeed it is not that, but rather pride and humour. Repentance is a more submissive, humble thing. But this is what troubles some men at their new falls (especially if after a long time of even walking and running), they think their project is now spoiled, their thoughts are broken off: they would have had somewhat to have rejoiced in, if they had still gone on to the end; but being disappointed of that, they think they had as good let alone and give over. Oh! but the humble Christian is better taught, his falls indeed teach him to abhor himself; they discover his own weakness to him, and empty him of self-trust; but they do not dismay him to get up and go on, not boldly and carelessly forgetting his fall, but, in the humble sense of it, walking the more warily, yet not the less swiftly; yea, the more swiftly too, making the more haste to regain the time lost by the fall. So then, if you would run in this way, depend on the strength of God, and on His Spirit leading thee, that so thou mayest not fall. And yet if thou dost fall, arise, and if thou art plunged in the mire, go to the fountain opened for sin and uncleanness, and wash there; bemoan thyself before thy Lord, and if hurt and bleeding by thy fall, yet look to Him, desire Jesus to pity thee, and bind up and cure thy wound, washing off thy blood, and pouring in of His own.

However it is with thee, give not over, faint not, run on. And that thou mayest run the more easily and expeditely, make thyself as lightly as may be, "lay aside every weight" (Heb. xii. 1, 2). Clog not thyself with unnecessary burdens of earth, and especially lay aside that which, of all things, weighs the heaviest, and cleaves the closest, "the sin that so easily besets us," and is so hardly put off us, that folds so connaturally to us, and we therefore think will not hinder us much. And not only the sins that are more outward, but the inner, close-cleaving sins, the sin that most of all sits easily to us; not only our cloak, but our inner coat, away with that too, as our Saviour says in another case, and "run the race set before us," our appointed stage, and that with patience, under all oppositions and discouragements from the world without, and from sin within. And to encourage thee in this, look to such a "cloud of witnesses," that compasseth us about to further us, as troubles, temptations, and sin do to hinder us. They encountered the like sufferings, and were encumbered with the like sins; and yet they ran on, and got home. Alexander would have run in the Olympic games if he had had kings to run with; now in this race, kings and prophets and righteous persons run; yea, all are indeed a kingly generation, each one heir to a crown, as the prize of this race.

And if these encourage thee but little, then look beyond them, above that cloud of witnesses, to the "Sun," the "Sun of Righteousness;" looking off from all things here, that would either entangle thee or discourage thee, taking thine eye off from them, and looking to Him who will powerfully draw thee and animate thee. "Look to Jesus," not only as thy "forerunner" in this race, but also as thy "undertaker" in it, "the author and finisher of our faith." His attaining the end of the race is the pledge of thy attaining, if thou follow Him cheerfully on the same encouragements that He looked to: "Who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross, and despised the shame, and is now set down at the right hand of God."

"When Thou shall enlarge my heart." In all beings the heart is the principle of motion, and according as it is more or less perfect in its kind, those motions which flow from it are more or less vigorous. Therefore hath the Psalmist good reason, to the end his spiritual course may be the stedfaster and the faster, to desire that the principle of it (the heart), may be more enabled and disposed, which here he expresses by its being "enlarged."

What this "enlargement of the heart" is, a man's own inward sense should easily explain to him. Surely it would, did men reflect on it, and were they acquainted with their own hearts; but the most are not. They would find the carnal natural heart a narrow, contracted, hampered thing, bound with cords and chains of its own twisting and forging, and so incapable of walking, much less of running, in this way of God's commandments, till it be freed and enlarged.

The heart is taken generally in Scripture for the whole soul, the understanding, and the will, in its several affections and motions; and the phrase being here of an "enlarged heart," it seems very congruous to take it in the most enlarged sense.

It is said of Solomon that he had a "large heart" (the same word that is here), "as the sand of the sea-shore" (1 Kings iv. 29); that is, a vast comprehensive spirit, that could fathom much of nature, both its greater and lesser things. "He spake of trees, from the cedar in

Lebanon, to the hyssop in the wall, and of great beasts and small creeping things." Thus, I conceive, the "enlargement of the heart" compriseth the enlightening of the understanding. There arises a clearer light there to discern spiritual things in a more spiritual manner; to see the vast difference betwixt the vain things the world goes after, and the true solid delight that is in the "way of God's commandments"—to know the false blush of the pleasures of sin, and what deformity is under that painted mask, and not be allured by it; to have enlarged apprehensions of God, His excellency, and greatness, and goodness; how worthy He is to be obeyed and served. This is the great dignity and happiness of the soul; all other pretensions are low and poor in respect of this. Here then is enlargement, to see the purity and beauty of His law; how just and reasonable, yea, how pleasant and amiable it is, "that His commandments are not grievous," that they are beds of spices,—the more we walk in them, still the more of their fragrant smell and sweetness we find.

And then, consequently, upon the larger and clearer knowledge of these things, the heart dilates itself in affection; the more it knows of God, still the more it loves Him, and the less it loves this present world. Love is the great enlarger of the heart to all obedience. Then nothing is hard, yea, the harder things become the more delightful.

All love of other things doth pinch and contract the heart, for they are all narrower than itself. It is framed to that wideness in its first creation, capable of enjoying God, though not of a full comprehending of Him. Therefore all other things gather it in, and straiten it from its natural size, only the love of God stretches and dilates it. He is large enough for it; yea, it, in its fullest enlargement, is infinitely too narrow for Him. Do not all find it, if they will ask themselves, that in all other loves and pursuits in this world, there is still somewhat that pinches? The soul is not at its full size, but, as a foot in a strait shoe, is somewhere bound and pained, and cannot go freely, much less run; though another who looks on cannot tell where, yet each one feels it. But when the soul is set free from these narrow things, and is raised to the love of God, then is it at ease and at large, and hath room enough; it is both "elevated" and "dilated." And this word signifies a "high raised soul," and is sometimes taken for "proud" and "lofty," but there is a "greatness" and "height" of spirit in the love of God and union with Him, that doth not vainly swell and lift it up, but, with the deepest humility, joins the highest and truest magnanimity. It sets the soul above the snares that lie here below, in which most men creep and are entangled in that "way of life" which "is on high," "the just," as Solomon speaks.

Good reason hath David to join these together, and to desire the one as the spring and cause of the other; an "enlarged heart," that he might "run the way of God's commandments."

Sensible joys and consolations in God do encourage and enlarge the heart, but these are not so general to all, nor so constant to any. Love is the abounding fixed spring of ready obedience, and will make the heart cheerful in serving God, even without those felt comforts, when He is pleased to deny or withdraw them.

In that course or race are understood constancy, activity, and alacrity, and all these flow from the enlargement of the heart.

1. Constancy. A narrow enthralled heart, fettered with the love of lower things, and cleaving to some particular sins, or but some one, and that in secret, may keep foot a while in the way of God's commandments in some steps of things, but it must give up quickly, is not able to run on to the end of the goal. But a heart that hath laid aside every weight, and the most close-cleaving and besetting sin (as it is in that fore-cited place in the Epistle to the Hebrews), hath stripped itself of all that may falter or entangle it, it runs and runs on without fainting or wearying, it is at large, hath nothing that pains it in the race.

2. Activity. Not only holding on, but running, which is a swift nimble race. It stands not bargaining and disputing, but once knowing God's mind, there is no more question or demur. "I made haste and delayed not," as in this psalm the word is; did not stay upon why and wherefore. He stood not to reason the matter, but ran on. And this love, enlarging the heart, makes it abundant in the work of the Lord, quick and active, despatching much in a little time.

3. Alacrity. All is done with cheerfulness, so no other constraint is needful where this overpowering sweet constraint of love is. "I will run," not be hauled and drawn by force, but "skip" and "leap," as the evangelic promise is "That the lame shall leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing; for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert" (Isa. xxxv. 6). The spouse desires her beloved "to hasten as a roe and hind in the mountains of spices," and she doth so, and each faithful soul runs towards him to meet him in his way.

It is a sad heavy thing to do anything as in obedience to God while the heart is straitened, not enlarged towards Him by divine love; but that once taking possession and enlarging the heart, that inward principle of obedience makes the outward obedience sweet; it is then a natural motion. Indeed the soul runs in the ways of God as the sun in his course, which finds no difficulty, being naturally fitted and carried to that motion; he "goes forth as a bridegroom, and rejoices as a strong man to run a race."

This is the great point which our souls should

be studious of, to attain more evenness, and nimbleness, and cheerfulness, in the ways of God, and for this end we ought to seek, above all things, this enlarged heart. It is the want of this makes us bog and drive heavily, and run long upon little ground. Oh, my beloved, how shallow and narrow are our thoughts of God! Most even of those who are truly godly are led on by a kind of instinct, and carried they scarcely know how to give some attendance on God's worship, and to the avoidance of gross sin, and go on in a blameless course. It is better thus than to run to excess of riot and open wickedness with the ungodly world. But, alas! this is but a dull, heavy, and languid motion, when the heart is not enlarged by the daily growing love of God. Few, few are acquainted with that delightful contemplation of God, which ventilates and raises this flame of love. Petty things bind and contract our spirits, so that they feel little joy in God, little ardent, active desire to do Him service, to crucify sin, to break and undo self-love within us, to root up our own wills to make room for His, that His alone may be ours, that we may have no will of our own, that our daily work may be to grow more like Him in the beauty of holiness. You think it a hard saying to part with your carnal lusts and delights and the common ways of the world, and to be tied to a strict exact conversation all your days. But oh! the reason of this is because the heart is yet straitened and enthralled by the base love of these mean things, and that arises from the ignorance of things higher and better. One glance of God, a touch of His love, will free and enlarge the heart so that it can deny all, and part with all, and make an entire renouncing of all, to follow Him. It sees enough in Him, and in Him alone, and therefore can neither quietly rest on nor earnestly desire anything beside Him.

Oh, that you would apply your hearts to consider the excellence of this way of God's commandments. Our wretched hearts are prejudiced; they think it melancholy and sad. Oh, there is no way truly joyous but this! "They shall sing in the ways of the Lord," says the Psalmist (Ps. cxxxviii. 5). Do not men, when their eyes are opened, see a beauty in meekness, and temperance, and humility, a present delightfulness and quietness in them? Whereas in pride, and passion, and intemperance, there is nothing but vexation and disquiet. And then, consider the end of this way, and of this race in it, rest and peace for ever. It is the way of peace, both in its own nature and in respect of its end. Did you believe that joy and glory, which are set before you in this way, you would not any of you defer a day longer, but forthwith you would break from all that holds you back, and enter into this way, and run on cheerfully in it. The persuasion of those great things above would enlarge and greaten the heart, and make the greatest things here very little in your eyes.

But would you attain to this enlarged heart for this race, as you ought to apply your thoughts to these divine things, and stretch them on the promises made in the world, so, above all, take David's course; seek this enlargement of heart from God's own hand. For it is here propounded and laid before God by way of request: See what is my desire; I would gladly serve Thee better, and advance more in the way of Thy commandments. Now this I cannot do, till my heart be more enlarged, and that cannot be but by Thy hand "when Thou shalt enlarge my heart." Present this suit often: It is in His power to do this for thee. He can stretch and expand thy straitened heart, can hoist and spread the sails within thee, and then carry thee on swiftly; filling them, not with the vain air of man's applause, which readily runs a soul upon rocks and splits it, but with the sweet breathings and soft gales of his own Spirit, which carry it straight to the desired haven.

Findest thou sin cleaving to thee and clogging thee? Cry to Him: "Help, Lord! set me free from my narrow heart." I strive, but in vain without Thee; still it continues so. I know little of Thee; my affections are dead and cold towards Thee. Lord, I desire to love Thee, here is my heart; and lest it fly out, lay hold on it, and take Thine own way with it, though it should be in a painful way, yet draw it forth; yea, draw it that it may run after Thee. All is His own working, and all His motive His own free grace. Let who will fancy themselves masters of their own hearts, and think to enlarge them by the strength of their own stretches of speculation; they alone, they alone are in the sure and happy way of attaining it, who humbly sue and wait for this enlargement of heart from His hand who made it.

EXHORTATIONS TO CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS.

The complaint with regard to the variety of all perishing and transitory enjoyments, which has been long general among mankind, is indeed just and well founded; but it is no less true, that the vanity which resides in the heart of man himself, exceeds everything of that kind we observe in the other parts of the visible creation; for, amongst all the creatures that we see around us, we can find nothing so fleeting and inconstant; it flutters hither and thither, and forsaking that only perfect good, which is truly suited to its nature and circumstances, grasps at phantoms and shadows of happiness, which it pursues with a folly more than childish.

Man wanders about on this earth; he hopes, he wishes, he seeks, he gropes, and feels about him; he desires, he is hot, he is cold, he is blind, and complains that evil abounds everywhere; yet he is himself the cause of those evils

which rage in the world, but most of all in his own breast; and therefore, being tossed between the waves thereof, that roll continually within and without him, he leads a restless and disordered life, until he be at last swallowed up in the unavoidable gulf of death, It is, moreover, the shame and folly of the human race, that the greatest part of them do not resolve upon any fixed and settled method of life, but, like the brute creatures, live and die without design, and without proposing any reasonable end. For how few are there, who seriously and frequently consider with themselves whence they come, whither they are going, and what is the purpose of their life; who are daily reviewing the state of their own minds, and often descend into themselves, that they may as frequently ascend, by their thoughts and meditations, to their exalted Father and their heavenly country, who take their station upon temporal things, and view these that are eternal! Yet, these are the only men that can be truly said to live, and they alone can be accounted wise.

And to this it is, my dear youths, that I would willingly engage your souls; nay, I heartily wish they were carried thither by the fiery chariots of celestial wisdom. Let the common sort of mankind admire mean things; let them place their hopes on riches, honours, and arts, and spend their lives in the pursuit of them; but let your souls be inflamed with a far higher ambition. Yet I would not altogether prohibit you these pursuits: I only desire you to be moderate in them. These enjoyments are neither great in themselves, nor permanent; but it is surprising how much vanity is inflated by them. What a conceited vain nothing is the creature we call man. For, because few are capable to discern true blessings, which are solid and intrinsically beautiful, therefore the superficial ones, and such as are of no value at all, are catched at; and those who in any measure attain to the possession of them, are puffed up and elated thereby.

If we consider things as they are, it is an evidence of a very wrong turn of mind, to boast of titles and fame; as they are no part of ourselves, nor can we depend upon them. But he that is elevated with a fond conceit of his own knowledge is a stranger to the nature of things, and particularly to himself, since he knows not that the highest pitch of human knowledge ought in reality rather to be called ignorance. How small and inconsiderable is the extent of our knowledge! Even the most contemptible things in nature are sufficient to expose the greatness of our ignorance. And, with respect to Divine things, who dares to deny that the knowledge mankind has of them is next to nothing? Because the weak eyes of our understanding, confined, as they are, within such narrow houses of clay, cannot bear the piercing light of Divine things; therefore the Fountain of all wisdom hath thought proper to communicate such imperfect discoveries of Himself, as are barely sufficient to direct our steps to the superior regions of perfect light. And whoever believes this truth will doubtless make it his chief care and principal study constantly to follow the lamp of Divine light that shines in darkness, and not to deviate from it, either to the right hand or the left. It is indeed my opinion that no man of ingenuity ought to despise the study of philosophy, or the knowledge of languages, or grammar itself; though to be sure, a more expeditious and successful method of teaching them were much to be wished. But what I would recommend with the greatest earnestness, and persuade you to, if possible, is, that you would inseparably unite with such measures of learning and improvement of your minds as you can attain, purity of religion, Divine love, moderation of soul, and an agreeable, inoffensive behaviour. For you are not ignorant what a low and empty figure the highest attainments in human sciences must make, if they be compared with the dignity and duration of the soul of man; for, however considerable they may be in themselves, yet, with regard to their use and their whole design, they are confined within the short space of your perishing life. But the soul, which reasons, which is employed in learning and teaching, in a few days will for ever bid farewell to all these things, and remove to another country. Oh, how inconsiderable are all arts and sciences, all eloquence and philosophy, when compared with a cautious concern that our last exit out of this world may be happy and auspicious, and that we may depart out of this life candidates of immortality, at which we can never arrive but by the beautiful way of holiness.

Amidst these amusements we are unhappily losing a day. Yet some part of the weight of this complaint is removed, when we consider that, while the greatest part of mankind are bustling in crowds, and places of traffic, or, as they would have us believe, in affairs of great importance, we are trifling our time more innocently than they. But what should hinder us from closing this last scene in a serious manner, that is, from turning our eyes to more divine objects, whereby, though we are fatigued with other matters, we may terminate the work of this day and the day itself agreeably; as the beams of the sun use to give more than ordinary delight when he is near his setting?

You are now initiated into the philosophy, such as it is, that prevails in the schools, and, I imagine, intend, with all possible despatch, to apply to higher studies. But oh! how pitiful and scanty are all those things which beset us before, behind, and on every side! The bustling we see is nothing but the hurrying of ants eagerly engaged in their little labours. The mind must

surely have degenerated, and forgotten its original as effectually as if it had drunk of the river Lethe, if, extricating itself out of all these mean concerns and designs, as so many snares laid for it, and rising above the whole of this visible world, it does not return to its Father's bosom, where it may contemplate His eternal beauty, where contemplation will inflame love, and love be crowned with the possession of the beloved object. But, in the contemplation of this glorious object, how great caution and moderation of mind is necessary, that, by prying presumptuously into His secret councils, or His nature, and rashly breaking into the sanctuary of light, we be not quite involved in darkness! And, with regard to what the infinite, independent, and necessarily-existent Being has thought proper to communicate to us concerning Himself, and we are concerned to know, even that is by no means to be obscured by curious, impertinent questions, nor perplexed with the arrogance of disputation; because by such means, instead of enlarging our knowledge, we are in the fair way to know nothing at all; but readily to be received by humble faith, and entertained with meek and pious affections. And if, in these notices of Him, that are communicated to us, we meet with anything obscure, and hard to be understood, such difficulties will be happily got over, not by perplexed controversies, but by constant and fervent prayer. "He will come to understand," says, admirably well, the famous Bishop of Hippo, "who knocks by prayer, not he who, by quarrelling, makes a noise at the gate of truth." But what can we, who are mortal creatures, understand with regard to the inexpressible Being we now speak of, especially while we sojourn in these dark prisons of clay, but only this, that we can by no means comprehend Him? For though, in thinking of Him, we remove from our idea all sort of imperfection, and collect together every perceivable perfection, and adore the whole with the highest titles, we must, after all, acknowledge that we have said nothing, and that our conceptions are nothing to the purpose. Let us, therefore, in general acknowledge Him to be the immovable Being that moveth everything; the immutable God that changeth all things at His pleasure; the infinite and eternal fountain of all good, and of all existence, and the Lord and sole ruler of the world.

If you then, my dear youths, aspire to genuine Christianity, that is, the knowledge of God and divine things, I would have you consider that the mind must first be recalled, and engaged to turn in upon itself before it can be raised up towards God, according to that expression of St Bernard, "May I return from external things to those that are within myself, and from these again rise to those that are of a more exalted nature." But the greatest part of men live abroad, and are, truly, strangers at home; you may sooner find them anywhere than with themselves. Now is not this real madness, and the highest degree of insensibility? Yet, after all, they seem to have some reason in their madness, when they thus stray away from themselves, since they can see nothing within themselves that, by its promising aspect, can give them pleasure or delight. Everything that is ugly, frightful, and full of nastiness, which they would rather be ignorant of than be at the pains to purge away; and therefore prefer a slothful forgetfulness of their misery to the trouble and labour of regaining happiness. But how preposterous is the most diligent study and the highest knowledge when we neglect that of ourselves! The Roman philospher, ridiculing the grammarians of his time, observes, "that they inquired narrowly into the misfortunes of Ulysses, but were quite ignorant of their own." The sentiments of a wise and pious man are quite different, and I wish you may adopt them. It is his principal care to be thoroughly acquainted with himself, he watches over his own ways, he improves and cultivates his heart as a garden—nay, a garden consecrated to the King of kings, who takes particular delight in it; he carefully nurses the heavenly plants and flowers, and roots up all the wild and noxious weeds, that he may be able to say, with the greatest confidence, "Let my beloved come into His own garden, and be pleased to eat of His fruits." And when, upon this invitation, the great King, in the fulness of His goodness, descends into the mind, the soul may then easily ascend with Him, as it were, in a chariot of fire, and look down upon the earth, and all earthly things, with contempt and disdain. Then rising above the rainy regions, it sees the storms falling beneath its feet, and tramples upon the hidden thunder.

RICHARD BAXTER.

615-1691.

RIGHT REJOICING.*

THE soul is active and will be doing, and there is nothing that it is more naturally inclined to than delight. Something or other which may be suitable to it, and sufficient to answer its desires, it fain would be rejoicing in. And the spiritual part of all our mercies is pure and refined, and too subtle for the discerning of our carnal minds, and therefore is invisible to the dark ungodly world; and, also, it is contrary to the interest of the flesh, and to the present bent of man's concupiscence; and therefore it is that spiritual mercies are not perceived nor relished by the flesh, yea, that they are refused as food by a sick stomach with enmity and loathing, as if they were judgments or plagues, and not mercies; and hence it is that a carnal mind doth as unwillingly accept of any mercies of this sort as if it were some heavy service that made God almost beholden to Him to accept them. But the objects of sense, the matters of commodity, or honour, or sensual pleasure, are such as the worst of men are more eager after than any other; they are things that flesh itself doth savour and can judge of, and is naturally now too much in love with. And, therefore, there being so much of this concupiscence yet within us, the best have need so to be excited to the spiritual part of their rejoicing, as to be warned and called off from the carnal part. Our successes and our other common mercies have all of them both a carnal and a spiritual part, somewhat that is suited to our bodies, and somewhat to our souls. And as we are all too prone to be sensible and regardful of our bodily affairs and interests, and too insensible and neglectful of the matters of our souls; so we can easily pick out so much of providences and mercies as gratify and accommodate our flesh, and there we would stop and know no more, as if we had no spiritual part to mind, nor the mercy of any spiritual part to be improved. To rejoice in mere prosperity and success may be done without grace by pride and sensuality, as easily as a drunkard can be merry with his cups, or any other sinner in his sin. Think it not needless, then, to hear this admonition; take heed that you rejoice not carnally in the carcase or outside only of your mercies, as such an outside religion, consisting in the shell of duty, without God, who is the life and kernel, is not religion indeed, but an hypocritical self-deceiving show, so you may turn a day of thanksgiving into a day of fleshly mirth, more sinful than a morris-dance or May-game, because of the aggravation of conjunct hypocrisy if you set not a faithful guard upon your hearts.

For the rectifying, therefore, and elevating of your joys, I am first to tell you that there is a matter of far greater joy before you than all the successes or prosperity of the world; and if it be not, yet being freely offered you, your acceptance may quickly make it such. Eternal joy and glory is at hand; the door is open, the promise is sure, the way made plain, the helps are many, and safe, and powerful; you may have the conduct of Christ, and the company of thousands (though the smaller number), if you will go this way; there are passengers every day going on and entering in; many that were here the last year are this year in heaven, yea, many that were yesterday on earth are in heaven to-day. It is another kind of assembly and solemnity than this that they are now beholding, and you may behold. One strain of that celestial melody doth afford more ravishing sweetness and delight than all that ever earth could yield. If a day in God's courts here be better than a thousand in common employments or delights, then surely a day in heaven is better than ten thousand. That is the court, and (except the church, which is a garden that hath some celestial plants, and is a seminary or nursery for heaven), this world is the dunghill. There all is spiritual, pure, and perfect, the soul, the service, and the joy; but here they are all so mixed with flesh, and therefore so imperfect and impure, that we are afraid of our very comforts, and are fain, upon the review, to sorrow over many of our joys.

We come now from cares and troubles to our feasts; and our wedding garments smell of the smoke; and a secret disquietness in the midst of our delights doth tell us that the root of our troubles doth remain, and that yet we are not where we should be, and that this is not our resting-place. We lay by our cares and sorrows on these days with our old clothes, to take them up again to-morrow, and alas! they are our ordinary week-day habits; and it were well it were only so; but even in laughter the hear is sorrowful; and in our sweetest joys we feel such imperfections as threateneth a relapse unto our former troubles. But the face of God admitteth no such imperfections in the joy of the beholders; there we shall have joy without either feeling or fear of sorrow, and praises without any mixtures of complaint. Our sweetest love to the Lord of love will feel no

* Part of a Sermon preached at St Paul's, before the Corporation of London, May 10, 1660, the day of thanksgiving for the Restoration of Charles II.

bounds and fear no end. Oh! what unspeakable delights will fill that soul that now walks mournfully, and feedeth upon complaints and tears! How the glory of God will make that face to shine for ever that now looks too dejectedly, and is darkened with griefs and worn with fears, and daily wears a mourning visage! No trouble can enter into the heavenly Jerusalem, nor is there a mournful countenance in the presence of our King. Self troubling was the fruit of sin and weakness, of ignorance, mistakes, and passion, and, therefore, is unknown in heaven, being pardoned and laid by with our flesh among the rest of our childish weaknesses and diseases. That poor, afflicted, wounded soul, that breathes in trouble as its daily air, and thinks it is made up of grief and fear, shall be turned into love and joy, and be unspeakably higher in those heavenly delights than ever it was low in sorrow.

O blessed face of the most glorious God! O happy presence of our glorified! O blessed beams of the eternal love, that will continually shine upon us! O blessed work! to behold, to love, to delight, and praise! O blessed company of holy angels, and perfect saints, so perfectly united, so exactly seated, to concord in those felicitating works; where all these are what sorrow can there be? what relics of distress, or smallest scars of our ancient wounds? Had I but one such friend as the meanest angel in heaven to converse with, how easily could I spare the courts of princes, the popular concourse, the learned academies, and all that the world accounteth pleasure, to live in the sweet and secret converse of such a friend! How delightfully should I hear him discourse of the ravishing love of God, of the glory of His face, the person of our Redeemer, the continued union of the glorified human nature with the divine, and of the Head, with all the glorified members, and His influences on His imperfect ones below! of the dignity, quality, and work of saints and angels, and of the manner of their mutual converse. How gladly would I retire from the noise of laughter, the compliments of comic gallants, the clatter and vain glory of a distracted world, or any of the more mainly inferior delights, to walk with one such heavenly companion! O how the beams of his illuminated intellect would promote my desired illumination, and the flames of his love to the most glorious God would reach my heart; what life and heavenly sweetness there would be in all his speeches; that little of heaven that I have perceived on some of the servants of the Lord, that are conversant above in the life of faith, doth make them more amiable, and their converse much more delectable to me than all the feastings, music, or merriments in the world. O then what a world of joy and glory will that be, where we shall not only converse with them that have seen the Lord, and are perfect in the beatifical vision and fruition, but also shall ourselves everlastingly behold and enjoy Him in perfection. That world all true believers see; they see it by faith in the holy glass which the spirit in the apostles and prophets hath set up; and they have the earnest and first fruits of it themselves, even that spirit by which they are sealed hereunto; that world we are ready to take possession of; we are almost there; we are but taking our leave of the inhabitants and affairs of earth, and better, putting on our heavenly robes, and we are presently there. A few nights more to stay on earth, a few words more to speak to the sons of men, a few more duties to perform, and a few more troublesome steps to pass, will be a small inconsiderable delay. This room will hold you now but an hour longer, and this world but a few hours more, but heaven will be the dwelling-place of saints to all eternity. These faces of flesh that we see to-day we shall see but a few times more, if any; but the face of God we shall see for ever. That glory no dismal times shall darken, that joy no sorrow shall interrupt, no sin shall forfeit, no enemy shall endanger or take from us, no changes shall ever dispossess us of. And should not a believer then rejoice that his name is written in heaven? and that every providence wheels him on? and whether the way be fair or foul it is thither that he is travelling? O sirs! if heaven be better than vanity and vexation; if endless joy be better than the laughter of a child that ends in crying; and if God be better than a delusory world, you have then greater matters set before you to be the matter of your joy than prosperity and success, or anything that flesh and blood delights in.

NOW OR NEVER.

We are constrained oft to fear lest there be much wrong in us, that should more seriously preach the awakening truths of God unto men's hearts. And verily our consciences cannot but accuse us, that when we are most lively and serious, alas, we seem but almost to trifle, considering on what a message we come, and of what transcendent things we speak. But Satan hath got his advantage upon our hearts that should be instrumental to kindle theirs; as well as on theirs that should receive the truth. O that we could thirst more after their salvation! O that we could pray harder for it, and entreat them more earnestly, as those that were loth to take a denial from God or man! I must confess to you all with shame and sorrow, that I am even amazed, to think of the hardness of my own heart that melteth no more in compassion to the miserable, and is no more earnest and importunate with sinners, when I am upon such a subject as this, and am telling them that it must be now or never; and when the messengers of death within, and the fame of men's displeasure from

without, doth tell me how likely it is that my time shall be but short, and if I will say anything that may reach the heart of sinners, for aught I know, it must be now or never. Oh, what an obstinate, what a lamentable disease is this insensibility, and hardness of heart. If I were sure that this were the last sermon that ever I should preach, I find now my heart would show its sluggishness, and rob poor souls of the serious fervour which is suitable to the subject and their case, and needful to the desired success.

But yet, poor, sleepy sinners, hear us. Though we speak not to you as men would do that had seen heaven and hell, and were themselves in a perfectly awakened frame, yet hear us while we speak to you the words of truth with some seriousness and compassionate desire of your salvation. Oh, look up to your God! Look out unto eternity; look inward upon your souls; look wisely upon your short and hasty time; and then bethink you how the little remnant of your time should be employed; and what it is that most concerneth you to despatch and secure before you die. Now you have sermons, books, and warnings; it will not be so long. Preachers must have done; God threateneth them, and death threateneth them, and man threateneth them; and it is you, it is you that are most severely threatened, and that are called on by God's warnings: "If any man have an ear to hear, let him hear." Now, you have abundance of private helps; you have abundance of understanding, gracious companions; you have the Lord's day to spend in holy exercises, for the edification and solace of your souls; you have choice of sound and serious books; and, blessed be God, you have the protection of a Christian and a Protestant king and magistracy. Oh, what invaluable mercies are all these! Oh, know your time, and use these with industry; and improve this harvest for your souls. For it will not be thus always; it must be now or never.

You have yet time and leave to pray and cry to God in hope. Yet, if you have tongues and hearts, He hath a hearing ear; the Spirit of grace is ready to assist you. It will not be thus always; the time is coming when the loudest cries will do no good. Oh, pray, pray—poor, needy, miserable sinners, for it must be now or never.

You have yet health and strength, and bodies fit to serve your souls; it will not be so always; languishing, and pains, and death are coming. Oh, use your health and strength for God, for it must be now or never.

Yet there are some stirrings of conviction in your consciences; you find that all is not well with you; and you have some thoughts or purposes to repent and be new creatures. There is some hope in this, that yet God hath not quite forsaken you. Oh, trifle not, and stifle not the convictions of your consciences, but hearken to the witness of God within you. It must be now or never.

Would you not be loath to be left to the despairing case of many poor distressed souls, that cry out, "Oh, it is now too late! I fear my day of grace is past! God will not hear me now if I should call upon Him. He hath forsaken me, and given me over to myself. It is too late to repent, too late to pray, too late to think of a new life—all is too late!" This case is sad, but yet many of these are in a safer and better case than they imagine, and are but frightened by the tempter; and it is not too late while they cry out it is too late. But if you are left to cry in hell, "It is too late!" alas! how long and how doleful a cry and lamentation will it be.

O consider, poor sinner, that God knoweth the time and season of thy mercies! He giveth the spring and harvest in their season, and all His mercies in their season; and wilt thou not know thy time and season for love, and duty, and thanks to Him?

Consider, thy God who hath commanded thee thy work, hath also appointed thee thy time; and this is His appointed time. To-day, therefore, hearken to His voice, and see that thou harden not thy heart. He that bids thee repent, and work out thy salvation with fear and trembling, doth also bid thee do it now. Obey Him in the time, if thou wilt be indeed obedient. He best understandeth the fittest time. One would think, to men that have lost so much already, and loitered so long, and are so lamentably behindhand, and stand so near the bar of God and their everlasting state, there should be no need to say any more to persuade them to be up and doing. I shall add but this: you are never likely to have a better time. Take this, or the work will grow more difficult, more doubtful, if, through the just judgment of God, it become not desperate. If all this will not serve, but still you will loiter till time be gone, what can your poor friends do but lament your misery? The Lord knows, if we knew what words, what pains would tend to your awakening, and conversion, and salvation, we should be glad to submit to it; and we hope we should not think our labours, or liberties, or our lives too dear to promote so blessed and necessary a work. But if, when all is done that we can do, you will leave us nothing but our tears and moans for self-destroyers, the sin is yours, and the suffering shall be yours. If I can do no more, I shall leave this on record, that we took our time to tell you home, that serious diligence is necessary to your salvation, and that God is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him, and that this was your day, your only day. It must be now or never!

ISAAC BARROW.

1630-1677.

GOODNESS.

VIRTUE is not a mushroom, that springeth up of itself in one night when we are asleep or regard it not, but a delicate plant, that groweth slowly and tenderly, needing much pains to cultivate it, much care to guard it, much time to mature it in our untoward soil, in this world's unkindly weather. Happiness is a thing too precious to be purchased at an easy rate; heaven is too high to be come at without much climbing; the crown of bliss is a prize too noble to be won without a long and a tough conflict. Neither is vice a spirit that will be conjured down by a charm, or with a presto driven away; it is not an adversary that can be knocked down at a blow, or despatched with a stab. Whoever shall pretend that at any time, easily, with a celerity, by a kind of legerdemain, or by any mysterious knack, a man may be settled in virtue, or converted from vice, common experience abundantly will confute him, which showeth that a habit otherwise (setting miracles aside), cannot be produced or destroyed, than by a constant exercise of acts suitable or opposite thereto, and that such acts cannot be exercised without voiding all impediments, and framing all principles of action (such as temper of body, judgment of mind, influence of custom) to a compliance; that who by temper is peevish or choleric, cannot, without mastering that temper, become patient or meek; that who, from vain opinions, is proud, cannot, without considering away those opinions, prove humble; that who by custom is grown intemperate, cannot, without weaning himself from that custom, come to be sober; that who, from the concurrence of a sorry nature, fond conceit, mean breeding, and scurvy usage, is covetous, cannot, without draining all those sources of his fault, be turned into liberal. The change of our mind is one of the greatest alterations in nature, which cannot be compassed in any way or within any time we please; but it must proceed on leisurely and regularly, in such order, by such steps as the nature of things doth permit; it must be wrought by a resolute and laborious perseverance, by a watchful application of mind in voiding prejudices, in waiting for advantages, in attending to all we do, by forcible wresting our nature from its bent, and swimming against the current of impetuous desires; by a patient disentangling ourselves from practices most agreeable and familiar to us; by a wary fencing with temptations; by long struggling with manifold oppositions and difficulties, whence the Holy Scripture termeth our practice a warfare, wherein we are to fight many a bloody battle with most redoubtable foes, a combat which must be managed with our best skill and utmost might; a race which we must pass through with incessant activity and swiftness.

If, therefore, we mean to be good or to be happy, it behoveth us to lose no time; to be presently up at our great task; to snatch all occasions, to embrace all means incident of reforming our hearts and lives. As those, who have a long journey to go, do take care to set out early, and in this way make good speed, lest the night overtake them before they reach their home, so it being a great way from hence to heaven, seeing we must pass over so many obstacles, through so many paths of duty, before we arrive thither, it is expedient to set forward as soon as can be, and to proceed with all expedition: the longer we stay the more time we shall need, and the less we shall have.

We may consider that no future time which we can fix upon will be more convenient than the present is for our reformation. Let us pitch on what time we please, we shall be as unwilling and unfit to begin as we are now; we shall find in ourselves the same indisposition, the same averseness, or the same listlessness toward it as now; there will occur the like hardships to deter us, and the like pleasures to allure us from our duty; objects will then be as present, and will strike as smartly upon our senses; the case will appear just the same, and the same pretences for delay will obtrude themselves; so that we shall be as apt then as now to prorogue the business. We shall say then, To-morrow I will mend; and when that morrow cometh, it will be still to-morrow, and so the morrow will prove endless. If, like the simple rustic (who stayed by the river side waiting till it had done running, so that he might pass dry-foot over the channel), we do conceit that the sources of sin (bad inclinations within, and strong temptations abroad) will of themselves be spent or fail, we shall find ourselves deluded. If ever we come to take up, we must have a beginning with some difficulty and trouble; we must courageously break through the present with all its enchantments; we must undauntedly plunge into the cold stream; we must rouse ourselves from our bed of sloth; we must shake off that brutish improvidence which detaineth us; and why should we not assay it now? There is the same reason now that ever we can have, yea, far more reason now; for if that we now begin hereafter at any determinate time some of the work will be done, what remaineth

will be shorter and easier to us.—*Sermon, The Danger and Mischief of delaying Repentance.*

PRAYER.

We cannot ever be framing or venting long prayers with our lips, but almost ever our mind can throw pious glances, our heart may dart good wishes upwards; so that hardly any moment (any considerable space of time) shall pass without some lightsome flashes of devotion. As bodily respiration, without intermission or impediment, doth concur with all our actions, so may that breathing of soul, which preserveth our spiritual life, and ventilateth that holy flame within us, well conspire with all other occupations.

For devotion is of a nature so spiritual, so subtle, and penetraut, that no matter can exclude or obstruct it. Our minds are so exceedingly nimble and active that no business can hold pace with them, or exhaust their attention and activity. We can never be so fully possessed by any employment, but that divers vacuities of time do intercur, wherein our thoughts and affections will be diverted to other matters. As a covetous man, whatever beside he is doing, will be carking about his bags and treasures; an ambitious man will be devising on his plots and projects; a voluptuous man will have his mind in his dishes; a lascivious man will be doting on his amours; a studious man will be musing on his notions; every man according to his particular inclination, will lard his business and besprinkle all his actions with cares and wishes tending to the enjoyment of what he most esteemeth and affecteth; so may a good Christian, through all his undertakings, wind in devout reflections and pious motions of soul toward the chief object of his mind and affection. Most businesses have wide gaps, all have some chinks, at which devotion may slip in. Be we never so urgently set or closely intent upon any work (be we feeding, be we travelling, be we trading, be we studying), nothing yet can forbid, but that we may together wedge in a thought concerning God's goodness.—*Sermon, The Duty of Prayer.*

INCITEMENTS TO INDUSTRY.

Industry is commended to us by all sorts of examples, deserving our regard and imitation. All nature is a copy thereof, and the whole world a glass wherein we may behold this duty represented to us.

We may easily observe every creature about us incessantly working towards the end for which it was designed, indefatigably exercising the power with which it is endued, diligently observing the laws of its creation. Even beings void of reason, of sense, of life itself, do suggest unto us resemblances of industry; they being set in continual action toward the effecting reasonable purposes, conducing to the preservation of their own beings, or to the furtherance of common good.

The heavens do roll about with unwearied motion; the sun and stars do perpetually dart their influences; the earth is ever labouring in the birth and nourishment of plants; the plants are drawing sap, and sprouting out fruits and seeds, to feed us and propagate themselves; the rivers are running, the seas are tossing, the winds are blustering, to keep the elements sweet in which we live.

Solomon sendeth us to the ant, and biddeth us to consider her ways, which provideth her meat in the summer, and gathereth her food in the harvest. Many such instructors we may find in nature; the like industrious providence we may observe in every living creature; we may see this running about, that swimming, another flying, in purveyance of its food and support.

If we look up higher to rational and intelligent natures, still more noble and apposite patterns do object themselves to us.

Here below, every field, every shop, every street, the hall, the exchange, the court itself (all full of business, and fraught with the fruits of industry), do mind us how necessary industry is to us.

If we consult history, we shall there find that the best men have been industrious; that all great persons, renowned for heroical goodness (the worthy patriarchs, the holy prophets, the blessed apostles), were for this most commendable; that, neglecting their private ease, they did undertake difficult enterprises, they did undergo painful labours, for the benefit of mankind; they did pass their days, like St Paul, in labours and toilsome pains, for these purposes.

Our great example, the life of our blessed Lord himself, what was it but one continual exercise of labour? His mind did ever stand bent in careful attention, studying to do good. His body was ever moving in wearisome travel to the same divine intent.

If we yet soar further in our meditation to the superior regions, we shall there find the blessed inhabitants of heaven, the courtiers, and ministers of God, very busy and active; they do vigilantly wait on God's throne, in readiness to receive and to despatch His commands; they are ever on the wing, and fly about like lightning to do His pleasure. They are attentive to our needs, and ever ready to protect, to assist, and to relieve us. Especially, they are diligent guardians and succourers of good men; officious spirits, sent forth to minister for the heirs of salvation; so even the seat of perfect rest is no place of idleness.

Yes, God himself, although immovably and infinitely happy, is yet immensely careful and

everlastingly busy; He rested once from that great work of creation; but yet "my Father," saith our Lord, "worketh still," and He never will rest from His works of providence and grace. His eyes continue watchful over the world, and His hands stretched out in upholding it. He hath a singular regard to every creature, supplying the needs of each, and satisfying the desires of all.

And shall we alone be idle, while all things are so busy? Shall we keep our hands in our bosom, or stretch ourselves on our beds of laziness, while all the world about us is hard at work in pursuing the designs of its creation? Shall we be wanting to ourselves while so many things labour for our benefit? Shall not such a cloud of examples stir us to some industry? Not to comply with so universal a practice, to cross all the world, to disagree with every creature—is it not very monstrous and extravagant?

JOHN TILLOTSON.

1630-1694.

THE DIGNITY OF MAN.

CONSIDER him in himself, as compounded of soul and body. Consider man in his outward and worst part, and you shall find that to be admirable, even to astonishment; in respect of which the Psalmist cries out (Psalm cxxxix. 14), "I am fearfully and wonderfully made; marvellous are thy works, and that my soul knoweth right well." The frame of our bodies is so curiously wrought, and every part of it so full of miracle, that Galen (who was otherwise backward enough to the belief of a God), when he had anatomised man's body, and carefully surveyed the frame of it, viewed the fitness and usefulness of every part of it, and the many several intentions of every little vein, and bone, and muscle, and the beauty of the whole; he fell into a pang of devotion, and wrote a hymn to his Creator. And those excellent books of his, *De Usu Partium*, "of the usefulness and convenient contrivance of every part of the body," are a most exact demonstration of the Divine wisdom, which appears in the make of our body; of which books, Gassendus saith the whole work is writ with a kind of enthusiasm. The wisdom of God, in the frame of our bodies, very much appears by a curious consideration of the several parts of it; but that requiring a very accurate skill in anatomy, I choose rather wholly to forbear it, than by my unskilfulness to be injurious to the Divine wisdom.

But this *domicilium corporis*, "the house of our body," though it be indeed a curious piece, yet it is nothing to the noble inhabitant that dwells in it. The cabinet, though it be exquisitely wrought, and very rich; yet it comes infinitely short in value of the jewel that is hid and laid up in it. How does the glorious faculty of reason and understanding exalt us above the rest of the creatures. Nature hath not made that particular provision for man, which it hath made for other creatures, because it hath provided for him in general, in giving him a mind and reason. Man is not born clothed, nor armed with any considerable weapon for defence; but he hath reason and understanding to provide these things for himself; and this alone excels all the advantages of other creatures; he can keep himself warmer and safer; he can foresee dangers, and provide against them; he can provide weapons that are better than horns, and teeth, and paws, and, by the advantage of his reason, is too hard for all other creatures, and can defend himself against their violence.

If we consider the mind of man yet nearer, how many arguments of divinity are there in it. That there should be at once in our understandings distinct comprehensions of such variety of objects; that it should pass in its thoughts from heaven to earth in a moment, and retain the memory of things past, and take a prospect of the future, and look forward as far as eternity. Because we are familiar to ourselves, we cannot be strange and wonderful to ourselves; but the great miracle of the world is the mind of man, and the contrivance of it an eminent instance of God's wisdom.

Consider man with relation to the universe, and you shall find the wisdom of God doth appear, in that all things are made so useful for man, who was designed to be the chief inhabitant of this visible world, the guest whom God designed principally to entertain in this house which he built. Not that we are to think that God hath so made all things for man, that He hath not made them at all for Himself, and possibly for many other uses than we can imagine; for we much overvalue ourselves, if we think them to be only for us; and we diminish the wisdom of God, in restraining it to one end; but the chief and principal end of many things is the use and service of man; and in reference to this end, you shall find that God hath made abundant and wise provision.

More particularly we will consider man, in his natural capacity as a part of the world. How many things are there in the world for the service

and pleasure, for the use and delight of man, which, if man were not in the world, would be of little use? Man is by nature a contemplative creature, and God has furnished him with many objects to exercise his understanding upon, which would be so far useless and lost, if man were not. Who should observe the motions of the stars, and the courses of those heavenly bodies, and all the wonders of nature? Who should pry into the secret virtues of plants, and other natural things, if there were not in the world a creature endowed with reason and understanding? Would the beasts of the field study astronomy, or turn chemists, and try experiments in nature?

What variety of beautiful plants and flowers is there, which can be imagined to be of little other use but for the pleasure of man. And if man had not been, they would have lost their grace, and been trod down by the beasts of the field, without pity or observation; they would not have made them into garlands and nosegays. How many sorts of fruits are there which grow upon high trees out of the reach of beasts; and, indeed, they take no pleasure in them. What would all the vast bodies of trees have served for, if man had not been to build with them, and make dwellings of them? Of what use would all the mines of metal have been, and of coal, and the quarries of stone? would the mole have admired the fine gold? would the beasts of the forest have built themselves palaces, or would they have made fires in their dens?—*Sermon, The Wisdom of God in the Creation of the World.*

DOING GOOD.*

When almighty God designed the reformation of the world, and the restoring of man to the image of God, the pattern after which he was first made, He did not think it enough to give us the most perfect laws of holiness and virtue, but hath likewise set before us a living pattern, and a familiar example to excite and encourage us, to go before us and show us the way, and as it were to lead us by the hand, in the obedience of those laws. Such is the sovereign authority of God over men, that He might, if He had pleased, have only given us a law written with His own hand, as he did to the people of Israel from Mount Sinai; but such is His goodness that He had sent a great Ambassador from heaven to us, "God manifested in the flesh," to declare and interpret His will and pleasure, and not only so, but to fulfil that law Himself, the observation whereof He requires of us. The bare rules of a good life are a very dead and ineffectual thing in comparison of a living example, which shows us the possibility and practicableness of our duty, both that it may be done and how to do it. Religion, indeed, did always consist in an imitation of God, and in our resemblance of those excellences which shine forth in the best and most perfect being; but we may imitate Him now with much greater ease and advantage, since God was pleased to become man, on purpose to show us how men may become like to God. And this is one great end for which the Son of God came into the world, and "was made flesh, and dwelt among us," and conversed so long and familiarly with mankind, that, in His own person and life, He might give us the example of all that holiness and virtue which His laws require of us. And as He was in nothing liker the Son of God than in being and doing good, so is He in nothing a fitter pattern for our imitation than in that excellent character given of Him here in the text, that "He went about doing good."

Our Saviour's great work and business in the world, which was to do good; who employed Himself in being a benefactor to mankind. This refers more especially to His healing the bodily diseases and infirmities of men—"God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil," intimating to us, by this instance of His doing good, that He who took so much pains to rescue men's bodies from the power and possession of the devil, would not let souls remain under his tyranny. But though the text instances, though only in one particular, yet this general expression of doing good comprehends all those several ways whereby he was beneficial to mankind.

His great work and business in the world was to do good; the most pleasant and delightful, the most happy and glorious work in the world. It is a work of a large extent, and of a universal influence, and comprehends in it all those ways whereby we may be useful and beneficial to one another. And indeed it were pity that so good a thing should be confined within narrow bounds and limits. It reacheth to the souls of men, and to their bodies; and is conversant in all those ways and kinds whereby we may serve the temporal or spiritual good of our neighbour, and promote his present and his future happiness.

By good instruction; and under instruction I comprehend all the means of bringing men to the knowledge of their duty, and exciting them to the practice of it, by instructing their ignorance, and removing their prejudices, and rectifying their mistakes by persuasion and by proofs, and by making lasting provision for the promoting of these ends.

By instructing men's ignorance; and this is a duty which every man owes to another as he hath opportunity, but especially to those who are under our care and charge—our children and servants and near relations, those over whom we have a special authority, and a more immediate influence. This our blessed Saviour made His great work in the world, to instruct all sorts of

* "Who went about doing good" (Acts x. 38).

persons in the things which concern the kingdom of God, and to direct them in the way to eternal happiness; by public teaching, and by private conversation, and by taking occasion, from the common occurrences of human life, and every object that presented itself to him, to instil good counsel unto men, and to raise their minds to the consideration of divine and heavenly things; and though this was our Saviour's great employment, and is theirs more particularly whose office it is to teach others, yet every man hath private opportunities of instructing others, by admonishing them of their duty, and by directing them to the best means and helps of knowledge, such as books of piety and religion, with which they that are rich may furnish those who are unable to provide for themselves.

And then by removing men's prejudices against the truth, and rectifying their mistakes. This our Saviour found very difficult; the generality of those with whom He had to do being strongly prejudiced against Him and His doctrine by false principles, which they had taken in by education, and been trained up to by their teachers; and therefore He used a great deal of meekness in instructing those that opposed themselves, and exercised abundance of patience in bearing with the infirmities of men, and their dulness and slowness of capacity to receive the truth.

And this is great charity to consider the inveterate prejudices of men, especially those which are rooted in education, and which men are confirmed in by the reverence they bear to those that have been their teachers. And great allowance is to be given to men in this case, and time to bethink themselves, and to consider better, for no man that is in an error thinks he is so; and therefore, if we go violently to rend their opinions from them, they will but hold them so much the faster; but if we have patience to unrip them by degrees, they will at last fall in pieces of themselves.

And when this is done, the way is open for counsel and persuasion. And this our Saviour administered in a most powerful and effectual manner by encouraging men to repentance, and by representing to them the infinite advantages of obeying His laws, and the dreadful and dangerous consequences of breaking them. And these are arguments fit to work upon mankind, because there is something within us that consents to the equity and reasonableness of God's laws. So that, whenever we persuade men to their duty, how backward soever they may be to the practice of it, being strongly addicted to a contrary course, yet we have this certain advantage, that we have their consciences and the most inward sense of their minds on our side, bearing witness that what we counsel and persuade them to is for their good.

And, if need be, we must add reproof to council. This our Saviour did with great freedom, and sometimes with sharpness and severity, according to the condition of the persons he had to deal withal. But because of His great authority, being a teacher immediately sent from God, and of His intimate knowledge of the hearts of men, He is not a pattern to us in all the circumstances of discharging this duty, which, of any other, requires great prudence and discretion, if we intend to do good, the only end to be aimed at in it: for many are fit to be reproved, whom yet every man is not fit to reprove; and in that case we must get it done by those that are fit; and great regard must be had to the time and other circumstances of doing it, so as it may most probably have its effect.

I will mention but one way of instruction more, and that is by making lasting provision for that purpose; as, by founding schools of learning, especially to teach the poor to read, which is the key of knowledge; by building of churches, and endowing them; by buying or giving in impropriations, or the like. These are large and lasting ways of teaching and instructing others, which will continue when we are dead and gone; as it is said of Abel, that "being dead, he yet speaks." And this our Saviour virtually did, by appointing His apostles, after He had left the world, to "go and teach all nations;" and ordering a constant succession of teachers in His Church, to instruct men in the Christian religion, together with an honourable maintenance for them. This we cannot do in the way that He did, who had "all power in heaven and earth;" but we may be subservient to this design in the ways that I have mentioned, which I humbly commend to the consideration of those whom God hath blest with great estates, and made capable of effecting such great works of charity.

Another way of doing good to the souls of men is by good example. And this our blessed Saviour was in the utmost perfection; for He "fulfilled all righteousness, had no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth." And this we should endeavour to be, as far as the frailty of our nature and imperfection of our present state will suffer; for good example is an unspeakable benefit to mankind, and hath a secret power and influence upon those with whom we converse, to form them into the same disposition and manners. It is a living rule that teacheth man without trouble, and lets them see their faults without open reproof and upbraiding; besides that, it adds great weight to a man's counsel and persuasion when we see that he advises nothing but what he does, nor exacts anything from others from which he himself deserves to be excused; as, on the contrary, nothing is more cold and insignificant than good counsel from a bad man; one that does not obey his own precepts, nor follow the advice of which he is so forward to give to others.

These are the several ways of doing good to

the souls of men, wherein we, who are the disciples of the blessed Jesus, ought, in imitation of His example, to exercise ourselves according to our several capacities and opportunities. And this is the noblest charity and the greatest kindnesses that can be shown to human nature. It is in the most excellent sense to "give eyes to the blind, to set the prisoners at liberty;" to rescue men out of the saddest slavery and captivity, and to save souls from death. And it is the most lasting and endurable benefit, because it is to do men good to all eternity.

The other way of being beneficial to others is procuring their temporal good, and contributing to their happiness in this present life. And this, in subordination to our Saviour's great design of bringing men to eternal happiness, was a great part of His business and employment in this world. He went about healing all manner of diseases, and rescuing the bodies of men from the power and possession of the devil.

And though we cannot be beneficial to men in that miraculous manner that He was, yet we may be so in the use of ordinary means. We may comfort the afflicted and vindicate the oppressed, and do a great many acts of charity, which our Saviour, by reason of His poverty, could not do without a miracle. We may supply the necessities of those that are in want, "feed the hungry, and clothe the naked, and visit the sick," and minister to them such comforts and remedies as they are not able to provide for themselves. We may take a child that is poor, and destitute of all advantages of education, and bring him up in the knowledge and fear of God, and without any great expense put him into a way wherein, by his diligence and industry, he may arrive to a considerable fortune in the world, and be able afterwards to relieve hundreds of others. Men glory in raising great and magnificent structures, and find a secret pleasure to see sets of their own planting to grow up and flourish; but surely it is a greater and more glorious work to build up a man, to see a youth of our own planting, from the small beginnings and advantages we have given him, to grow up into a considerable fortune, to take root in the world, and to shoot up to such a height, and spread his branches so wide, that we who first planted him may ourselves find comfort and shelter under his shadow. We may many times, with a small liberality, shore up a family that is ready to fall, and struggles under such necessities that it is not able to support itself. And if our minds were as great as sometimes our estates are, we might do great and public works of a general and lasting advantage, and for which many generations to come might call us blessed. And those who are in the lowest condition may do great good to others by their prayers, if they themselves be as good as they ought; for "the fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.' The intercession of those who are in favour with God, as all good men are, are not vain wishes, but many times effectual to procure that good for others which their own endeavours could never have effected and brought about.

I have done with the first thing, the great work and business which our blessed Saviour had to do in the world, and that was to do good.

I proceed to our Saviour's diligence and industry in this work. He went about doing good; He made it the great business and constant employment of His life; He travelled from one place to another to seek out opportunities of being useful and beneficial to mankind.

How unwearied our blessed Saviour was in doing good. He made it His only business, and spent His whole life in it. He was not only ready to do good to those that came to Him and gave Him opportunity for it, and besought Him to do it, but went Himself from one place to another to seek out objects to exercise His charity upon. He went to those who could not, and to those who would not come to Him; for so it is written of Him, He "came to seek and to save that which was lost." He was contented to spend whole days in this work, to live in a crowd, and to be almost perpetually oppressed with company; and when His disciples were moved at the rudeness of the people in pressing upon Him, He rebuked their impatience; and for the pleasure He took in doing good, made nothing of the trouble and inconvenience that attended it.

If we consider how much He denied Himself in the chief comforts and conveniences of human life, that He might do good to others. He neglected the ordinary refreshments of nature, His meat, and drink, and sleep, that He might attend this work. He was at everybody's beck and disposal, to do them good. When He was doing cures in one place He was sent for to another; and He either went, or sent healing to them, and did by His word at a distance what He could not come in person to do. Nay, He was willing to deny Himself in one of the dearest things in the world, His reputation and good name; He was contented to do good, though He was ill thought of and ill spoken of for it. He would not refuse to do good on the Sabbath day, though He was accounted profane for so doing. He knew how scandalous it was among the Jews to keep company with publicans and sinners, and yet He would not decline so good a work for all the ill words they gave Him for it.

If we consider the malicious opposition and sinister construction that His good deeds met withal. Never did so much goodness meet with so much enmity, endure so many affronts, and so much contradiction of sinners. This great benefactor of mankind was hated and persecuted as if He had been a public enemy. While He was instructing them in the meekest manner,

they were ready to stone Him for telling them the truth; and when the fame of His miracles went abroad, though they were never so useful and beneficial to mankind, yet upon this very account they conspire against Him and seek to take away His life. Whatever He said or did, though never so innocent, never so excellent, had some bad interpretation put upon it, and the great and shining virtues of His life were turned into crimes and matter of accusation. For His casting out of devils He was called a magician; for His endeavour to reclaim men from their vices, "a friend of publicans and sinners;" for His free and obliging conversation, "a wine-bibber and a glutton." All the benefits which He did to men, and the blessings which He so liberally shed among the people, were construed to be a design of ambition and popularity, and done with an intention to move the people to sedition, and to make Himself a king, enough to have discouraged the greatest goodness, and have put a damp upon the most generous mind, and to make it sick and weary of well-doing. For what more grievous than to have all the good one does ill interpreted, and the best actions in the world made matter of calumny and reproach?

If we consider how cheerfully, notwithstanding all this, He persevered and continued in well-doing. It was not only His business but His delight—"I delight," says He, "to do Thy will, O my God;" the pleasure which others take in the most natural actions of life, in eating and drinking when they are hungry, He took in doing good. It "was His meat and drink to do the will of His Father." He plied this work with so much diligence as if He had been afraid He should have wanted time for it. "I must work the work of Him that sent me while it is day; the night cometh when no man can work." And when He was approaching towards the hardest and most unpleasant part of His service, but of all others the most beneficial to us—I mean His death and sufferings—He was not at ease in His mind till it was done; "How am I straitened," says He, "till it be accomplished;" and just before his suffering, with what joy and triumph does He reflect upon the good he had done in His life? "Father, I have glorified Thee upon earth, and finished the work which Thou hast given me to do!" What a blessed pattern is here of diligence and industry in doing good! How fair and lovely a copy for Christians to write after!

ROBERT SOUTH.

1633-1716.

FRIENDSHIPS HUMAN AND DIVINE.

WHEN we have said and done all; it is only the true Christian and the religious person who is or can be sure of a friend—sure of obtaining, sure of keeping him. But as for the friendship of the world, when a man shall have done all that he can to make one his friend, employed the utmost of his wit and labour, beaten his brains, and emptied his purse, to create an endearment between him and the person whose friendship he desires, he may, in the end, upon all these endeavours and attempts, be forced to write vanity and frustration; for by them all he may at last be no more able to get into the other's heart than he is to thrust his hand into a pillar of brass; the man's affection, amidst all these kindnesses done him, remaining wholly unconcerned and impregnable, just like a rock which, being plied continually by the waves, still throws them back again into the bosom of the sea that sent them, but is not at all moved by any of them.

People at first, while they are young and raw, and soft-natured, are apt to think it an easy thing to gain love, and reckon their own friendship a sure price of another man's. But when experience shall have once opened their eyes, and showed them the hardness of most hearts, the hollowness of others, and the baseness and ingratitude of almost all, they will then find that a friend is the gift of God, and that He only, who made hearts, can unite them. For it is He who creates those sympathies and suitablenesses of nature, that are the foundation of all true friendship, and then by His providence brings persons so affected together.

It is an expression frequent in Scripture, but infinitely more significant than at first it is usually observed to be, namely, that God gave such or such a person grace or favour in another's eyes. It is an invisible hand from heaven that ties this knot, and mingles hearts and souls, by strange, secret, and unaccountable conjunctions.

That heart shall surrender itself and its friendship to one man, at first view, which another has in vain been laying siege to for many years, by all the repeated acts of kindness imaginable.

Nay, so far is friendship from being of any human production, that, unless nature be predisposed to it by its own propensity or inclination, no arts of obligation shall be able to abate the secret hatreds and hostilities of some persons

towards others. No friendly offices, no addresses, no benefits whatsoever, shall ever alter or allay that diabolical rancour that frets and ferments in some hellish breasts, but that upon all occasions it will foam out at its foul mouth in slander and invective, and sometimes bite too in a shrewd turn or a secret blow. This is true and undeniable upon frequent experience, and happy those who can learn it at the cost of other men's.

But now, on the contrary, he who will give up his name to Christ in faith unfeigned, and a sincere obedience to all His righteous laws, shall be sure to find love for love, and friendship for friendship. The success is certain and infallible, and none ever yet miscarried in the attempt. For Christ freely offers His friendship to all, and sets no other rate upon so vast a purchase, but only that we would suffer Him to be our friend. Thou perhaps spendest thy precious time in waiting upon such a great one, and thy estate in presenting him, and probably, after all, hast no other reward, but sometimes to be smiled upon, and always to be smiled at; and when thy greatest and most pressing occasions shall call for succour and relief, then to be deserted and cast off, and not known.

Now, I say, turn the streams of thy endeavours another way, and bestow but half that hearty, sedulous attendance upon thy Saviour in the duties of prayer and mortification, and be at half that expense in charitable works, by relieving Christ in His poor members; and, in a word, study as much to please Him who died for thee, as thou dost to court and humour thy great patron, who cares not for thee, and thou shalt make Him thy friend for ever; a friend who shall own thee in thy lowest condition, speak comfort to thee in all thy sorrows, counsel thee in all thy doubts, answer all thy wants, and, in a word, "never leave thee, nor forsake thee." But when all the hopes that thou hast raised upon the promises or supposed kindnesses of the fastidious and fallacious great ones of the world, shall fail, and upbraid thee to thy face, He shall then take thee into His bosom, embrace, cherish, and support thee, and, as the Psalmist expresses it, "He shall guide thee with His counsel here, and afterwards receive thee into glory." —*Sermon, Of the Love of Christ to His Disciples.*

MAN AT THE MERCY OF FORTUNE.

Then for the friendships or enmities that a man contracts in the world, than which surely there is nothing that has a more direct and potent influence upon the whole of a man's life, whether as to happiness or misery, yet chance has the ruling stroke in them all.

A man by mere peradventure lights into company, possibly is driven into a house by a shower of rain for present shelter, and there begins an acquaintance with a person, which acquaintance and endearment grows and continues, even when relations fail, and perhaps proves the support of his mind and of his fortunes to his dying day.

And the like holds in enmities, which come much more easily than the other. A word unadvisedly spoken on the one side, or misunderstood on the other, any the least surmise or neglect, sometimes a bare gesture, nay, the very unsuitableness of one man's aspect to another man's fancy, has raised such an aversion to him as in time has produced a perfect hatred of him, and that so strong and tenacious that it has never left vexing and troubling him till, perhaps, at length it has worried him into his grave; yea, and after death, too, has pursued him in his surviving shadow, exercising the same tyranny upon his very name and memory.

It is hard to please men of some tempers, who indeed hardly know what will please themselves; and yet, if a man does not please them, which it is ten thousand to one if he does, if they can but have power equal to their malice (as sometimes, to plague the world, God lets them have), such an one must expect all mischief that power and spite, lighting upon a base mind, can possibly do him.

As for men's employments and preferments, every man that sets forth into the world comes into a great lottery, and draws some one certain profession to act and live by, but knows not the fortune that will attend him in it.

One man, perhaps, proves miserable in the study of the law, who might have flourished in that of physic or divinity. Another runs his head against the pulpit, who might have been very serviceable to his country at the plough. And a third proves a very dull and heavy philosopher, who possibly would have made a good mechanic, and have done well enough at the useful philosophy of the spade or the anvil.

Now, let this man reflect upon the time when all these several callings and professions were equally offered to his choice, and consider how indifferent it was once for him to have fixed upon any one of them, and what little accidents and considerations cast the balance of his choice rather one way than the other, and he will find how easily chance may throw a man upon a profession, which all his diligence cannot make him fit for.

And then, for the preferments of the world. He that would reckon upon all the accidents that they depend upon, may as well undertake to count the sands or to sum up infinity; so that greatness as well as an estate may, upon this account, be properly called a man's fortune, forasmuch as no man can state either the acquisition or preservation of it upon any certain rules —every man, as well as the merchant, being here truly an adventurer. For the ways by which it is obtained are various, and frequently contrary; one man, by sneaking and flattering, comes to riches and honour (where it is in the power of

fools to bestow them); upon observation whereof, another presently thinks to arrive to the same greatness by the same means, but striving, like the ass, to court his master, just as the spaniel had done before him, instead of being stroked and made much of, he is only rated off and cudgelled for all his courtship.

The source of men's preferments is most commonly the will, humour, and fancy of persons in power; whereupon when a prince or grandee manifests a liking to such a thing, such an art, or such a pleasure, men generally set about to make themselves considerable for such things, and thereby, through his favour, to advance themselves; and at length, when they have spent their whole time in them, and so are become fit for nothing else, that prince or grandee perhaps dies, and another succeeds him, quite of a different disposition, and inclining him to be pleased with quite different things. Whereupon these men's hopes, studies, and expectations are wholly at an end. And besides, though the grandee whom they build upon should not die or quit the stage, yet the same person does not always like the same things. For age may alter his constitution, humour, or appetite; or the circumstances of his affairs may put him upon different courses and counsels; every one of which accidents wholly alters the road to preferment. So that those who travel that road must be like highwaymen, very dexterous in shifting the way upon every turn; and yet their very doing so sometimes proves the means of their being found out, understood, and abhorred; and for this very cause that they who are ready to do anything are justly thought fit to be preferred to nothing.

Cæsar Borgia, base son to Pope Alexander VI., used to boast to his friend Machiavel, that he had contrived his affairs and greatness into such a posture of firmness that, whether his holy father lived or died, they could not but be secure. If he lived, there could be no doubt of them; and if he died, he had laid his interest so as to overrule the next election as he pleased. But all this while the politician never thought or considered that he might, in the meantime, fall dangerously sick, and that sickness necessitate his removal from the court, and that during his absence his father die, and so his interest decay, and his mortal enemy be chosen to the papacy, as, indeed, it fell out. So that, for all his exact plot, down was he cast from all his greatness, and forced to end his days in a mean condition, as it is pity but all such politic opiniators should.

Upon much the like account we find it once said of an eminent cardinal, by reason of his great and apparent likelihood to step into St Peter's chair, that in two conclaves he went in pope and came out cardinal.

So much has chance the casting voice in the disposal of all the great things of the world. That which men call merit is a mere nothing. For even when persons of the greatest worth and merit are preferred, it is not their merit but their fortune that prefers them. And then, for that other so much admired thing called policy, it is but little better; for when men have busied themselves, and beat their brains never so much, the whole result, both of their counsels and their fortunes, is still at the mercy of an accident. And, therefore, whosoever that man was that said that he had rather have a grain of fortune than a pound of wisdom, as to the things of this life, spoke nothing but the voice of wisdom and great experience.

JOHN HAMILTON,

LORD BELHAVEN.

1656-1708.

THE LEGISLATIVE UNION OF ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.*

My Lord Chancellor,—When I consider the affair of a union betwixt the two nations, as expressed in the several articles thereof, and now the subject of our deliberation at this time, I find my mind crowded with a variety of melancholy thoughts; and I think it my duty to disburden myself of some of them by laying them before, and exposing them to the serious consideration of this honourable House.

I think I see a free and independent kingdom delivering up that which all the world hath been fighting for since the days of Nimrod; yea, that for which most of all the empires, kingdoms, states, principalities, and the dukedoms of Europe are at this time engaged in the most bloody and cruel wars; to wit, a power to manage their own affairs by themselves, without the assistance and counsel of any other.

* A speech delivered in the Parliament of Scotland, November 2, 1706.

"In despite of Scotticisms, Gallicisms, overstretched classicality, and monstrous affectation, it [will] stand beside any effort of later English oratory; and probably were it examined at an age so distant as not to give the later speaker the benefit of a distinctly perceptible adaptation to acknowledged conventionalisms, it would be found to have few competitors among them in the essentials of heroic oratory, rapid and potent diction, impassioned appeal, bold and apt illustration."—*John Hill Burton.*

I think I see a national Church, founded upon a rock, secured by a claim of right, hedged and fenced about by the strictest and most pointed legal sanctions that sovereignty could contrive, voluntarily descending into a plain, upon an equal level with Jews, Papists, Socinians, Arminians, Anabaptists, and other sectaries.

I think I see the noble and honourable peerage of Scotland, whose valiant predecessors led armies against their enemies upon their own proper charges and expense, now divested of their followers and vassalages; and put upon such an equal foot with their vassals, that I think I see a petty English exciseman receive more homage and respect than what was paid formerly to their *quondam* MacCallammores.

I think I see the present peers of Scotland, whose noble ancestors conquered provinces, overran countries, reduced and subjected towns and fortified places, exacted tribute through the greatest part of England, now walking in the Court of Requests, like so many English attorneys; laying aside their walking swords when in company with the English peers, lest their self-defence should be found murder.

I think I see the honourable estate of barons, the bold assertors of the nation's rights and liberties in the worst of times, now setting a watch upon their lips, and a guard upon their tongues, lest they may be found guilty of *scandalum magnatum*, a speaking evil of dignities.

I think I see the royal state of burghers walking their desolate streets, hanging down their heads under disappointments wormed out of all the branches of their old trade, uncertain what hand to turn to, necessitated to become prentices to their unkind neighbours; and yet, after all, finding their trade so fortified by companies, and secured by prescriptions, that they despair of any success therein.

I think I see our learned judges laying aside their pratiques and decisions, studying the common law of England, gravelled with *certioraris*, *nisi priuses*, writs of error, verdicts, injunctions, demurs, etc., and frightened with appeals and avocations, because of the new regulations and rectifications they may meet with.

I think I see the valiant and gallant soldiery either sent to learn the plantation trade abroad, or at home petitioning for a small subsistence, as a reward of their honourable exploits; while their old corps are broken, the common soldiers left to beg, and the youngest English corps kept standing.

I think I see the honest industrious tradesman loaded with new taxes and impositions, disappointed of the equivalents,* drinking water in place of ale, eating his saltless pottage, petitioning for encouragement to his manufactures, and answered by counter petitions.

In short, I think I see the laborious ploughman, with his corn spoiling upon his hands for want of sale, cursing the day of his birth, dreading the expense of his burial, and uncertain whether to marry or do worse.

I think I see the incurable difficulties of the landed men, fettered under the golden chain of "equivalents," their pretty daughters petitioning for want of husbands, and their sons for want of employment.

I think I see our mariners delivering up their ships to their Dutch partners; and what through presses and necessity, earning their bread as underlings in the Royal English Navy!

But above all, my Lord, I think I see our ancient mother, Caledonia, like Cæsar, sitting in the midst of our senate, ruefully looking round about her, covering herself with her royal garment, attending the fatal blow, and breathing out her last with an *et tu quoque mi fili!*

Are not these, my Lord, very afflicting thoughts? And yet they are but the least part suggested to me by these dishonourable articles. Should not the consideration of these things vivify these dry bones of ours? Should not the memory of our noble predecessors' valour and constancy rouse up our drooping spirits? Are our noble predecessors' souls got so far into the English cabbage-stalk and cauliflowers, that we should show the least inclination that way? Are our eyes so blinded, are our ears so deafened, are our hearts so hardened, are our tongues so faltered, are our hands so fettered, that in this our day—I say, my Lord, in this *our* day—we should not mind the things that concern the very being and well-being of our ancient kingdom, before the day be hid from our eyes?

No, my Lord, God forbid! Man's extremity is God's opportunity: He is a present help in time of need—a deliverer, and that right early! Some unforeseen providence will fall out, that may cast the balance; some Joseph or other will say, "Why do ye strive together, since ye are brethren?" None can destroy Scotland save Scotland's self. Hold your hands from the *pen*, and you are secure! There will be a Jehovah-Jireh; and some ram will be caught in the thicket, when the bloody knife is at our mother's throat. Let us, then, my Lord, and let our noble patriots behave themselves like men, and we know not how soon a blessing may come.

I design not at this time to enter into the merits of any one particular article. I intend this discourse as an introduction to what I may

* "The 'equivalent,' or compensation, of £398,000 spoken of above, was to be distributed, a great portion of it, to the shareholders of the African and India Company, who had suffered so severely by the breaking up of the Darien settlement. As the shares must, in many instances, have changed hands, great inequality and disappointment was to be expected in the distribution of this money, which was likely, in most cases, to go into the hands of the friends of Government, as a bribe or recompense for services on this occasion."—*C. A. Goodrich.*

afterward say upon the whole debate, as it falls in before this honourable House; and therefore, in the further prosecution of what I have to say, I shall insist upon a few particulars, very necessary to be understood before we enter into the detail of so important a matter.

I shall therefore, in the first place, endeavour to encourage a free and full deliberation, without animosities and heats. In the next place, I shall endeavour to make an inquiry into the nature and source of the unnatural and dangerous divisions that are now on foot within this isle, with some motives showing that it is our interest to lay them aside at this time. And all this with all deference, and under the correction of this honourable House.

My Lord Chancellor, the greatest honour that was done unto a Roman was to allow him the glory of a triumph; the greatest and most dishonourable punishment was that of a parricide. He that was guilty of parricide was beaten with rods upon his naked body till the blood gushed out of all the veins of his body; then he was sewed up in a leathern sack called a *culeus*, with a cock, a viper, and an ape, and thrown headlong into the sea.

My Lord, patricide is a greater crime than parricide, all the world over.

In a triumph, my Lord, when the conqueror was riding in his triumphal chariot, crowned with laurels, adorned with trophies, and applauded with huzzas, there was a monitor appointed to stand behind him to warn him not to be high-minded nor puffed up with overweening thoughts of himself; and to his chariot were tied a whip and a bell, to remind him that, notwithstanding all his glory and grandeur, he was accountable to the *people* for his administration, and would be punished as other men if found guilty.

The greatest honour among *us*, my Lord, is to represent the sovereign's sacred person [as High Commissioner] in Parliament; and in one particular it appears to be greater than that of a triumph, because the whole legislative power seems to be entrusted with him. If he give the royal assent to an act of the estates, it becomes a law obligatory upon the subject, though contrary to or without any instructions from the sovereign. If he refuse the royal assent to a vote in Parliament, it cannot be a law, though he has the sovereign's particular and positive instructions for it.

His Grace the Duke of Queensberry, who now represents her Majesty in this session of Parliament, hath had the honour of that great trust as often, if not more, than any Scotchman ever had. He hath been the favourite of two successive sovereigns; and I cannot but commend his constancy and perseverance, that, notwithstanding his former difficulties and unsuccessful attempts, and maugre some other specialities not yet determined, his Grace has yet had the resolution to undertake the most unpopular measure last. If his Grace succeed in this affair of a union, and that it prove for the happiness and welfare of the nation, then he justly merits to have a statue of gold erected for himself; but if it shall tend to the entire destruction and abolition of our nation, and that we, the nation's trustees, shall go into it, then I must say that a whip and a bell, a cock, a viper, and an ape, are but too small punishments for any such bold unnatural undertaking and complaisance.

1. That I may pave the way, my Lord, to a full, calm, and free reasoning upon this affair, which is of the last consequence unto this nation, I shall mind this honourable House that we are the successors of those noble ancestors who founded our monarchy, framed our laws, amended, altered, and corrected them from time to time, as the affairs and circumstances of the nation did require, without the assistance or advice of any foreign power or potentate, and who, during the time of two thousand years, have handed them down to us, a free independent nation, with the hazard of their lives and fortunes. Shall not we, then, argue for that which our progenitors have purchased for us at so dear a rate, and with so much immortal honour and glory? God forbid! Shall the hazard of a father unbind the ligaments of a dumb son's tongue? and shall we hold our peace when our *patria*, our country, is in danger?* I say this, my Lord, that I may encourage every individual member of this House to speak his mind freely. There are many wise and prudent men among us who think it not worth their while to open their mouths; there are others who can speak very well, and to good purpose, who shelter themselves under the shameful cloak of silence, from a fear of the frowns of great men and parties. I have observed, my Lord, by my experience, the greatest number of speakers in the most trivial affairs; and it will always prove so while we come not to the right understanding of the oath *de fideli*, whereby we are bound not only to give our vote but our *faithful advice* in Parliament, as we should answer to God. And in our ancient laws the representatives of the honourable barons and the royal boroughs are termed "spokesmen." It lies upon your Lordships, therefore, particularly to take notice of such whose modesty makes them bashful to speak. Therefore I shall leave it upon you, and conclude this point with a very memorable saying of an honest private gentleman to a great queen, upon occasion of a state project, contrived by an able statesmen, and the favourite to a great king, against a peaceful obedient people, because of the diversity of their laws and constitutions: "If at this time thou hold thy peace, salvation shall come to the people from another

* In allusion to the story of Crœsus and his dumb child, as related by Herodotus.

place, but thou and thy house shall perish." I leave the application to each particular member of this House.*

2. My Lord, I come now to consider our divisions. We are under the happy reign, blessed be God, of the best of queens, who has no evil design against the meanest of her subjects; who loves all her people, and is equally beloved by them again; and yet, that under the happy influence of our most excellent Queen, there should be such divisions and factions, more dangerous and threatening to her dominions than if we were under an arbitrary government, is most strange and unaccountable. Under an arbitrary prince all are willing to serve, because all are under a necessity to obey, whether they will or not. He chooses, therefore, whom he will, without respect to either parties or factions; and if he think fit to take the advice of his councils or parliaments, every man speaks his mind freely, and the prince receives the faithful advice of his people, without the mixture of self-designs. If he prove a good prince, the government is easy; if bad, either death or a revolution brings a deliverance, whereas here, my Lord, there appears no end of our misery, if not prevented in time. Factions are now become independent, and have got footing in councils, in parliaments, in treaties, in armies, in incorporations, in families, among kindred; yea, man and wife are not free from their political jars.

It remains, therefore, my Lord, that I inquire into the nature of these things; and since the names give us not the right idea of the thing, I am afraid I shall have difficulty to make myself well understood.

The names generally used to denote the factions are Whig and Tory; as obscure as that of Guelfs and Ghibellines; yea, my Lord, they have different significations, as they are applied to factions in each kingdom. A Whig in England is a heterogeneous creature: in Scotland he is all of a piece. A Tory in England is all of a piece, and a statesman: in Scotland he is quite otherwise—an anti-courtier and anti-statesman.

A Whig in England appears to be somewhat like Nebuchadnezzar's image, of different metals, different classes, different principles, and different designs; yet, take them altogether, they are like a piece of some mixed drugget of different threads; some finer, some coarser, which, after all, make a comely appearance and an agreeable suit. Tory is like a piece of loyal home-made English cloth, the true staple of the nation, all of a thread; yet if we look narrowly into it, we shall perceive a diversity of colours, which, according to the various situations and positions, make various appearances. Sometimes Tory is like the moon in its full; as appeared in the affair of the Bill of Occasional Conformity. Upon other occasions, it appears to be under a cloud, and as if it were eclipsed by a greater body; as it did in the design of calling over the illustrious Princess Sophia. However, by this we may see their designs are to outshoot Whig in his own bow.

Whig, in Scotland, is a true blue Presbyterian, who, without considering time or power, will venture his all for the Kirk, but something less for the State. The greatest difficulty is how to describe a Scotch Tory. Of old, when I knew them first, Tory was an honest-hearted, comradish fellow, who, provided he was maintained and protected in his benefices, titles, and dignities, by the State, was the less anxious who had the government of the Church. But now, what he is since *jure divino* came in fashion, and that Christianity, and by consequence salvation, comes to depend upon Episcopal ordination, I profess I know not what to make of him; only this I must say for him, that he endeavours to do by opposition that which his brother in England endeavours by a more prudent and less scrupulous method.

Now, my Lord, from these divisions there has got up a kind of aristocracy, something like the famous triumvirate at Rome. They are a kind of undertakers and pragmatic statesmen, who, finding their power and strength great, and answerable to their designs, will make bargains with our gracious sovereign; they will serve her faithfully, but upon their own terms; they must have their own instruments, their own measures. This man must be turned out, and that man put in, and then they will make her the most glorious queen in Europe.

Where will this end, my Lord? Is not her Majesty in danger by such a method? Is not the monarchy in danger? Is not the nation's peace and tranquillity in danger? Will a change of parties make the nation more happy? No, my Lord. The seed is sown that is like to afford us a perpetual increase. It is not an annual herb, it takes deep root; it seeds and breeds; and if not timely prevented by her Majesty's royal endeavours, will split the whole island in two.

3. My Lord, I think, considering our present circumstances at this time, the Almighty God has reserved this great work for us. We may bruise this hydra of division, and crush this cockatrice's egg. Our neighbours in England

* "An appeal is here made, not merely to those members of Parliament who were at first awed into silence by the authority of the Court, but to the Squadroné Volanté, or Flying Squadron, a party headed by the Marquis of Tweeddale, who held the balance of power, and were accustomed to throw themselves, during the progress of a debate, on that side where they could gain most. This party had thus far maintained a cautious silence, and the object of Lord Belhaven was to urge them, under the pressure of a general and indignant public sentiment, to declare themselves at once on the popular side, before the influence of the Court had time to operate through patronage or bribery."—*C. A. Goodrich.*

are not yet fitted for any such thing; they are not under the afflicting hand of Providence, as we are. Their circumstances are great and glorious; their treaties are prudently managed, both at home and abroad; their generals brave and valorous, their armies successful and victorious; their trophies and laurels memorable and surprising; their enemies subdued and routed, their strongholds besieged and taken. Sieges relieved, marshals killed and taken prisoners, provinces and kingdoms are the results of their victories. Their royal navy is the terror of Europe; their trade and commerce extended through the universe, encircling the whole habitable world, and rendering their own capital city the emporium for the whole inhabitants of the earth.* And which is yet more than all these things, the subjects freely bestowing their treasure upon their sovereign; and above all, these vast riches, the sinews of war, and without which all the glorious success had proved abortive, these treasures are managed with such faithfulness and nicety, that they answer seasonably all their demands, though at never so great a distance. Upon these considerations, my Lord, how hard and difficult a thing will it prove to persuade our neighbours to a self-denying bill.

'Tis quite otherwise with us, my Lord, as we are an obscure, poor people, though formerly of better account, removed to a distant corner of the world, without name, and without alliances; our posts mean and precarious; so that I profess I don't think any one post in the kingdom worth the briguing [seeking] after, save that of being Commissioner to a long session of a factious Scotch Parliament, with an antedated commission, and that yet renders the rest of the ministers more miserable. What hinders us then, my Lord, to lay aside our divisions, to unite cordially and heartily together in our present circumstances, when our all is at stake? Hannibal, my Lord, is at our gates—Hannibal is come within our gates—Hannibal is come the length of this table—he is at the foot of the throne. He will demolish the throne if we take not notice. He will seize upon these regalia. He will take them as our *spolia opima*, and whip us out of this House, never to return again.

For the love of God, then, my Lord, for the safety and welfare of our ancient kingdom, whose sad circumstances I hope we shall yet convert into prosperity and happiness! We want no means if we unite. God blessed the peacemakers. We want neither men nor sufficiency of all manner of things necessary to make a nation happy. All depends upon management. *Concordiâ res parvæ crescunt*—small means increase by concord. I fear not these Articles, though they were ten times worse than they are, if we once cordially forgive one another, and that according to our proverb, "Bygones be bygones," and fair play for time to come. For my part, in the sight of God, and in the presence of this honourable House, I heartily forgive every man, and beg that they may do the same to me. And I do most humbly propose that his Grace my Lord Commissioner may appoint an *Agape*, may order a love feast for this honourable House, that we may lay aside all self-designs, and after our fasts and humiliations, may have a day of rejoicing and thankfulness; may eat our meat with gladness, and our bread with a merry heart. Then shall we sit each man under his own fig-tree, and the voice of the turtle shall be heard in our land, a bird famous for constancy and fidelity.

My Lord, I shall pause here, and proceed no further in my discourse, till I see if his Grace my Lord Commissioner [Queensberry] will receive any humble proposals for removing misunderstandings among us, and putting an end to our fatal divisions. Upon my honour, I have no other design; and I am content to beg the favour upon my bended knees.

[No answer.]

My Lord Chancellor, I am sorry that I must pursue the thread of my sad and melancholy story. What remains is more afflictive than what I have already said. Allow me then to make this meditation—that if our posterity, after we are all dead and gone, shall find themselves under an ill-made bargain, and shall have recourse of our records for the names of the managers who made that treaty by which they have suffered so much, they will certainly exclaim: "Our nation must have been reduced to the last extremity at the time of this treaty! All our great chieftains, all our noble peers, who once defended the rights and liberties of the nation, must have been killed, and lying dead on the bed of honour, before the nation could ever condescend to such mean and contemptible terms! Where were the great men of the noble families—the Stewarts, Hamiltons, Grahams, Campbells, Johnstons, Murrays, Homes, Kers? Where were the two great officers of the Crown, the Constable and the Marischal of Scotland? Certainly all were extinguished, *and now we are slaves for ever!*"

But the English records; how will they make their posterity reverence the names of those illustrious men who made that treaty, and for ever brought under those fierce, warlike, and troublesome neighbours, who had struggled so long for independency, shed the best blood of their nation, and reduced a considerable part of their country to become waste and desolate!

I see the English Constitution remaining firm—the same two Houses of Parliament; the same taxes, customs, and excise; the same trade in companies, the same municipal laws, while all

* Perhaps in allusion to the battle of Blenheim and other victories of Marlborough which had recently taken place.

ours are either subjected to new regulations, or annihilated for ever! And for what? Only that we may have the honour to pay their old debts; and may have some few persons present [in Parliament] as witnesses to the validity of the deed, when they are pleased to contract more!

Good God! What? *Is* this an entire surrender? My Lord, I find my heart so full of grief and indignation, that I must beg pardon not to finish the last part of my discourse: but pause that I may drop a tear as the prelude to so sad a story!*

FRANCIS ATTERBURY.

1662-1732.

SPEECH BEFORE THE HOUSE OF LORDS, MAY 11, 1723.†

LET me speak, my Lords (always, I hope, with that modesty which becomes an accused person, but yet) with the freedom of an Englishman. Had nothing been opened to you concerning this man's character and secret transactions, could you possibly have believed the romantic tales he has told? Could this pretender to secrets have had, or shall he still have, any weight with your Lordships, who threw away his life rather than venture to stand to the truth of what he had said? Shall this man do more mischief by his death than he could have done if living? for then he could have been confronted, puzzled, and confounded; shame and consciousness might have made him unsay what he had said. But a dead man can retract nothing. What he has written he has written; the accusation must stand just as it is; and we are deprived of the advantages of those confessions, which truth and remorse had once extorted, and would again have extorted from him.

However, I should have been glad to have all that even this witness said, and would have hoped that, by a comparison of the several parts of the story he at several times told, some light might have been gained that is now wanting, particularly by the knowledge of what he said freely and voluntarily, and in good humour, before his rough usage upon his return from Deal had frightened him into new confession. But I think we have the evidence only of a few of the last days of his life. All the preceding time, when he was most in favour and confidence with a great man, is a blank; we have no account of it; and yet, it is said, he underwent frequent examinations during that time. But they were not, it seems, so maturely weighed and digested as to be thought worth being committed to writing.

But he is gone to his place, and has answered for what he has said at another tribunal. I desire not to blemish his character any further than is absolutely necessary to my own just defence.

Our law has taken care that there should be a more clear and full proof of treason than of any other crime whatsoever. And reasonable it is, that a crime, attended with the highest penalties, should be made out by the clearest and fullest evidence. And yet here is a charge of high treason brought against me, not only without full evidence, but without any evidence at all, *i.e.*, any such evidence as the law of the land knows and allows. And what is not evidence at law (pardon me for what I am going to say) can never be made such, in order to punish what is past, but by a violation of the law. For the law, which prescribes the nature of the proof required, is as much the law of the land as that which declares the crime; and both must join to convict a man of guilt. And it seems equally unjust to declare any sort of proof legal, which was not so before a prosecution commenced for any act done, as it would be to declare the act itself *ex post facto* to be criminal.

Now there never was a charge of so high a nature so strongly pressed, and so weakly supported—supported, not by any living or dead witness, speaking from his own knowledge, but by mere hearsays and reports from others, contradicted by the very persons from whom they are said to be derived—supported not by any one criminal deed proved to have been done, not by any one criminal line proved to have been either written or received, not even by any one criminal word proved to have been spoken by me; but by intercepted letters in a correspondence, to which it appears not that I was, and to which it is certain that I was not privy; some of these letters shewn to have been contrived with a design of fastening them upon me, as a

* "This fervent appeal had no effect. The Treaty of Union was ratified by a majority of thirty-three out of two hundred and one members. That it was carried by bribery is now matter of history. Documents have been brought to light, showing that the sum of £20,000 was sent to Queensberry for this purpose by the English ministers; and the names of those to whom the money was paid, belonging chiefly to the Squadron6, are given in full."—*C. A. Goodrich.*

† Atterbury had been apprehended and committed to the Tower on suspicion of being concerned in a plot to restore the Pretender, and the above is part of an eloquent speech in his own defence

foundation of the scheme which was to follow; others, written with the same view, employing the same fictitious names, and throwing out dark and suspicious hints, concerning the persons meant by those names, and endeavouring by little facts and circumstances, sometimes true, sometimes doubtful, and often false, to point out that person to such as should intercept those letters, who continues all this time a stranger to the whole transaction, and never makes the discovery till he feels it, and finds it advanced into a solemn accusation; till the pestilence that walked in darkness, becomes the arrow that flieth by noonday. . . . My Lords, this is my case; I have showed it so to be; though I had the hard task upon me of proving a negative, and had no other lights to guide me but those the report affords. And shall I stand convicted before your Lordships upon such an evidence as this? by the hearsay of an hearsay (for this often is the case), and that denied by the very person into whose testimony all must be resolved; by strained reasonings and inferences, from obscure passages, and fictitious names in letters, the contents of which were entirely a secret to me till I saw them in print, by the conjecturers of decipherers, without any opportunity given me (though I humbly asked it) to examine into the truth of their explications. . . .

Shall I, my Lords, be deprived of all that is valuable to an Englishman (for in the circumstances to which I am to be reduced, life itself is scarce valuable) by such an evidence as this—such an evidence as would not be admitted in any other cause, in any other court; nor allowed, I verily believe, to condemn a Jew in the Inquisitions of Spain or Portugal; shall it be received against me, a bishop of this Church, and a member of this House, in a charge of high treason brought in the High Court of Parliament? God forbid.

Suffer me, my Lords (I know you will suffer me) to put you all (and particularly my right reverend brethren) in mind of a text of holy writ: "Against an elder receive not an accusation but before two or three witnesses." It is not said, condemn him not upon an unsupported accusation; but, receive it not, give it no countenance or encouragement. And I am somewhat more than an elder as the word there imports. Shall an accusation be received against me, without any one witness to maintain it. My Lords, this is not a direction merely for ecclesiastical judicatories; it was taken by St Paul from the civil and judicial part of the law of Moses, for there we read: "One witness shall not rise up against a man for any iniquity, or any sin that he sinneth; at the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall the matter be established." And as this rule was transplanted from the State into the Church by an inspired authority, so would it be no blemish to any Christian state, if they always thought fit to follow it in such cases as this now before your Lordships. The laws of this Christian state have actually followed it, and made two witnesses necessary in accusations of treason. Shall I be the first bishop of this Church prosecuted and condemned upon two or three hearsays, two or three conjectures about names, and obscure passages in letters, instead of two or three witnesses? And will they who are most concerned to resist this precedent, contribute to make it, and to derive the sad influence of it to all succeeding times; and even concur in such an act, on such an evidence, to render me incapable of using or exercising any office, function, authority, or power, ecclesiastical or spiritual whatsoever? Is this either good divinity or good policy? I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say.

Doubtless the Legislature is without bounds. It may do what it pleases; and whatever it does is binding. Nay, in some respects it has greater power (with reverence be it spoken) than the Sovereign Legislator of the universe; for He can do nothing unjustly. But though no limits can be set to parliaments, yet they have generally thought fit to prescribe limits to themselves, and so to guide even their proceedings by bill in criminal cases, as to depart as little as is possible from the known laws and usages of the realm. The Parliament may, if it pleases, by a particular act, order a criminal to be tortured who will not confess; for who shall gainsay them? But they never did it; nor, I presume, ever will; because torture, though practised in other countries, is unknown in ours, and repugnant to the temper and genius of our mild and free government; and yet, my Lords, it looks, methinks, somewhat like torture, to inflict grievous pains and penalties on a person only suspected of guilt, but not legally proved guilty, in order to extort some confession or discovery from him. This, in other countries, is called putting to the question; and it matters not much by what engines or method such an experiment is made.

The Parliament may, if it pleases, by an express law, adjudge a man to absolute perpetual imprisonment, as well as to perpetual exile, without reserving to the Crown any power of determining such imprisonment. They have enacted the one; I find not they ever enacted the other. And the reason seems to have been because our law, which above all others provides for the liberty of the subject's person, knows nothing of such absolute perpetual imprisonment.

The Parliament may in like manner condemn a man upon a charge of accumulative and constructive treason. They did so once, in the case of the Earl of Strafford; but they repented of it afterwards, and ordered all the records and proceedings of Parliament relating thereto to be

wholly cancelled, defaced, and obliterated, to the intent the same might not be visible in after-ages, or brought into example to the prejudice of any person whatsoever. My Lords, it was the fate of that great person thus to fall by accumulative and constructive trèason. A much less now stands before you, who is attacked by accumulative and constructive proofs of his guilt; that is, by such proofs as in themselves, and when taken singly and apart, are allowed to prove nothing; but when taken together, and well interpreted and explained, are said to give mutual light and strength to each other, and by the help of certain inferences and deduction, to have the force though not the formality of legal evidence. Will such proofs be ever admitted by your Lordships, in order to deprive a fellow-subject of his fortunes, his fame, his friends, and his country, and send him in his old age, without language, without limbs, without health, and without a provision for the necessaries of life, to live, or rather starve, amongst foreigners? I say again, God forbid!

My ruin is not of that moment to any man, or any number of men, as to make it worth their while to violate (or even seem to violate) the constitution in any degree to procure it. In preserving and guarding that against all attempts, the safety and the happiness of every Englishman lies. But when once, by such extraordinary steps as these, we depart from the fixed rules and forms of justice, and try untrodden paths, no man knows whither they will lead him, or where he shall be able to stop, when pressed by the crowd that follow him.

Though I am worthy of no regard; though whatever is done to me may be looked upon as just, yet your Lordships will have some regard to your own lasting interests, and those of the State, and not introduce into criminal cases a sort of evidence with which our constitution is not acquainted, and which, under the appearance of supporting it at first, may be afterwards made use of (I speak my honest fears) gradually to undermine and destroy it.

For God's sake, my Lords, lay aside these extraordinary proceedings! set not these new and dangerous precedents! And I for my part will voluntarily and cheerfully go into perpetual exile, and please myself with the thought that I have in some measure preserved the constitution by quitting my country; and I will live, wherever I am, praying for its prosperity, and die with the words of Father Paul in my mouth, which he used of the Republic of Venice, *Esto perpetua!* The way to perpetuate it is, not to depart from it. Let me depart, but let that continue fixed on the immovable foundations of law and justice, and stand for ever. . . .

Had indeed the charge been as fully proved as it is strongly asserted, it had been in vain to think of encountering well-attested facts by protestations to the contrary, though never so solemnly made. But, as that charge is enforced by slights and probabilities, and cannot be disproved in many circumstances without proving a negative, your Lordships will, in such a case, allow the solemn asseverations of a man, in behalf of his own innocence, to have their due weight. And I ask no more of God than to grant them as much influence with you as they have truth in themselves.

If, after all, it shall be still thought by your Lordships that there is any seeming strength in any of the proofs produced against me; if by private persuasions of my guilt, founded on unseen, unknown motives, which ought not certainly to influence public judgments; if by any reasons and necessities of state (of the expedience, wisdom, and justice of which I am no competent judge) your Lordships shall be induced to proceed on this bill, and to pass it in any shape, I shall dispose myself quietly and patiently to submit to what is determined. God's will be done! Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither; the Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; and (whether in giving or taking) blessed be the name of the Lord!

CHURCH-MUSIC.

By the melodious harmony of the church, the ordinary hindrances of devotion are removed, particularly these three: that engagement of thought which we often bring with us into the church from what we last converse with; those incidental distractions that may happen to us during the course of divine service; and that weariness and flatness of mind which some weak tempers may labour under, by reason even of the length of it.

When we come into the sanctuary immediately from any worldly affair, as our very condition of life does, alas! force many of us to do, we come usually with divided and alienated minds. The business, the pleasure, or the amusement we left sticks fast to us, and perhaps engrosses the heart for a time, which should then be taken up altogether in spiritual addresses. But as soon as the sound of the sacred hymns strikes us, all that busy swarm of thoughts presently disperses: by a grateful violence we are forced into the duty that is going forward, and, as indevout and backward as we were before, find ourselves on the sudden seized with a sacred warmth, ready to cry out, with holy David, "My heart is fixed, O God, my heart is fixed; I will sing and give praise." Our misapplication of mind is often so great, and we so deeply immersed in it, that there needs some very strong and powerful charm to rouse us from it; and perhaps nothing is of greater force to this purpose than the solemn and awakening airs of church-music.

For the same reason, those accidental distractions that may happen to us are also best

cured by it. The strongest minds, and best practised in holy duties, may sometimes be surprised into a forgetfulness of what they are about by some violent outward impressions, and every slight occasion will serve to call off the thoughts of no less willing though much weaker worshippers. Those that come to see and to be seen here, will often gain their point, will draw and detain for a while the eyes of the curious and unwary. A passage in the sacred story read, an expression used in the common forms of devotion, shall raise a foreign reflection, perhaps, in musing and speculative minds, and lead them on from thought to thought, and point to point, till they are bewildered in their own imaginations. These, and a hundred other avocations, will arise and prevail; but when the instruments of praise begin to sound, our scattered thoughts presently take the alarm, return to their post and to their duty, preparing and arming themselves against their spiritual assailants.

Lastly, even the length of the service itself becomes a hindrance sometimes to the devotion which it was meant to feed and raise; for, alas! we quickly tire in the performance of holy duties; and as eager and unwearied as we are in attending upon secular business and trifling concerns, yet in divine offices, I fear, the expostulation of our Saviour is applicable to most of us: "What! can you not watch with me one hour?" This infirmity is relieved, this hindrance prevented or removed, by the sweet harmony that accompanies several parts of the service, and returning upon us at fit intervals, keeps our attention up to the duties when we begin to flag, and makes us insensible of the length of it. Happily, therefore, and wisely is it so ordered, that the morning devotions of the church, which are much the longest, should share also a greater proportion of the harmony which is useful to enliven them.

But its use stops not here, at a bare removal of the ordinary impediments to devotion; it supplies us also with special helps and advantages towards furthering and improving it. For it adds dignity and solemnity to public worship, it sweetly influences and raises our passions whilst we assist at it, and makes us do our duty with the greatest pleasure and cheerfulness, all which are very proper and powerful means towards creating in us that holy attention and erection of mind, the most reasonable part of this our reasonable service.

Such is our nature, that even the best things, and most worthy of our esteem, do not always employ and detain our thoughts in proportion to their real value, unless they be set off and greatened by some outward circumstances, which are fitted to raise admiration and surprise in the breast of those who hear or behold them. And this good effect is wrought in us by the power of sacred music. To it we, in good measure, owe the dignity and solemnity of our public worship; which else, I fear, in its natural simplicity and plainness, would not so strongly strike, or so deeply affect the minds, as it ought to do, of the sluggish and inattentive—that is, of the far greatest part of mankind. But when voice and instruments are skilfully adapted to it, it appears to us in a majestic die and shape, and gives us very awful and reverent impressions which, while they are upon us, it is impossible for us not to be fixed and composed to the utmost. We are then in the same state of mind that the devout patriarch was when he awoke from his holy dream, and ready with him to say to ourselves, "Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not. How dreadful is this place! This is none other but the house of God, and this the gate of heaven."

Further, the availableness of harmony to promote a pious disposition of mind will appear from the great influence it naturally has on the passions, which, when well directed, are the wings and sails of the mind that speed its passage to perfection, and are of particular and remarkable use in the offices of devotion; for devotion consists in an ascent of the mind towards God, attended with holy breathings of soul, and a divine exercise of all the passions and powers of the mind. These passions, the melody of sounds, serves only to guide and elevate towards their proper object; these it first calls forth and encourages, and then gradually raises and inflames. This it doth to all of them, as the matter of the hymns sung gives an occasion for the employment of them; but the power of it is chiefly seen in advancing that most heavenly passion of love which reigns always in pious breasts, and is the surest and most inseparable mark of true devotion, which recommends what we do in virtue of it to God, and makes it relishing to ourselves, and without which all our spiritual offerings, our prayers, and our praises are both insipid and unacceptable; at this our religion begins, and at this it ends; it is the sweetest companion and improvement of it here upon earth, and the very earnest and foretaste of heaven, of the pleasures of which nothing further is revealed to us than that they consist in the practice of holy music and holy love, the joint enjoyment of which, we are told, is to be the happy lot of all pious souls to endless ages.

JONATHAN SWIFT.

1667-1745.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.*

THIS day being set apart to acknowledge our belief in the Eternal Trinity, I thought it might be proper to employ my present discourse entirely upon that subject; and I hope to handle it in such a manner that the most ignorant among you may return home better informed of your duty in this great point than probably you are at present.

It must be confessed that, by the weakness and indiscretion of busy, or at best of well-meaning people, as well as by the malice of those who are enemies to all revealed religion, and are not content to possess their own infidelity in silence without communicating it, to the disturbance of mankind—I say, by these means, it must be confessed that the doctrine of the Trinity hath suffered very much, and made Christianity suffer along with it. For these two things must be granted: first, that men of wicked lives would be very glad there were no truth in Christianity at all; and, secondly, if they can pick out any one single article in the Christian religion which appears not agreeable to their own corrupted reason, or to the arguments of those bad people who follow the trade of seducing others, they presently conclude that the truth of the whole Gospel must sink along with that one article; which is just as wise as if a man should say, because he dislikes one law of his country he will therefore observe no law at all; and yet that one law may be very reasonable in itself, although he does not allow it, or does not know the reason of the law-givers.

Thus it hath happened with the great doctrine of the Trinity, which word is indeed not in the Scripture, but was a term of art invented in the earlier times to express the doctrine by a single word, for the sake of brevity and convenience. The doctrine, then, as delivered in Holy Scripture, though not exactly in the same words, is very short, and amounts only to this: that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are each of them God, and that there is but one God. For as to the word persons, when we say there are three persons; and as to those other explanations in the Athanasian creed this day read to you (whether compiled by Athanasius or not), they were taken up three hundred years after Christ to expound this doctrine, and I will tell you upon what occasion. About that time there sprang up a heresy of people called Arians, from one Arius, the leader of them. These denied our Saviour to be God, although they allowed all the rest of the Gospel, wherein they were more sincere than their followers among us. Thus the Christian world was divided into two parts, till at length, by the zeal and courage of St Athanasius, the Arians were condemned in a general council, and a creed formed upon the true faith, as St Athanasius hath settled it. This creed is now read at certain times in churches, which, although it is useful for edification to those who understand it, yet, since it contains some nice and philosophical points which few people can comprehend, the bulk of mankind is obliged to believe no more than the Scripture doctrine, as I have already delivered it, because that creed was intended only as an answer to the Arians in their own way, who were very subtle disputers.

But this heresy having revived in the world about a hundred years ago, and continued ever since, not out of zeal to truth, but to give a loose to wickedness by throwing off all religion, several divines, in order to answer the cavils of these adversaries to truth and morality, began to find out further explanations of this doctrine of the Trinity by rules of philosophy; which have multiplied controversies to such a degree as to beget scruples that have perplexed the minds of many sober Christians, who otherwise could never have entertained them.

I must, therefore, be bold to affirm that the method taken by many of those learned men to defend the doctrine of the Trinity hath been founded upon a mistake.

It must be allowed that every man is bound to follow the rules and discretion of that measure of reason which God hath given him; and indeed he cannot do otherwise, if he will be sincere, or act like a man. For instance, if I should be commanded by an angel from heaven to believe it is midnight at noon-day, yet I could not believe him. So if I were directly told in Scripture that three are one and one is three, I could not conceive or believe it in the natural common sense of that expression, but must suppose that something dark or mystical was meant, which it pleased God to conceal from me and from all the world. Thus in the text, "There are three that bear record," etc. Am I capable of knowing and defining what union and what distinction there may be in the divine nature, which possibly may be hid from the angels themselves? Again, I see it plainly declared in Scripture that there is but one God, and yet I find our Saviour

* "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one" (John v. 7).

claiming the prerogative of God in knowing men's thoughts, in saying, "He and His Father are one," and "Before Abraham was, I am." I read that the disciples worshipped Him; that Thomas said to Him, "My Lord and my God;" and St John, chap. i., "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." I read likewise that the Holy Ghost bestowed the power of working miracles, and the gift of tongues, which, if rightly considered, is as great a miracle as any, that a number of illiterate men should of a sudden be qualified to speak all the languages then known in the world, such as could be done by the inspiration of God alone. From these several texts, it is plain that God commands us to believe there is a union, and there is a distinction; but what that union, or what that distinction, is, all mankind are equally ignorant, and must continue so, at least till the day of judgment, without some new revelation.

But because I cannot conceive the nature of this union and distinction in the divine nature, am I therefore to reject them as absurd and impossible, as I would if any one told me that three men are one, and one man is three? We are told that a man and his wife are one flesh; this I can comprehend the meaning of, yet, literally taken, it is a thing impossible. But the apostle tells us, "We see but in part, and we know but in part;" and yet we would comprehend all the secret ways and workings of God.

Therefore I shall again repeat the doctrine of the Trinity, as it is positively affirmed in Scripture: that God is there expressed in three different names—as Father, as Son, and as Holy Ghost; that each of these is God, and that there is but one God. But this union and distinction are a mystery utterly unknown to mankind.

This is enough for any good Christian to believe on this great article, without ever inquiring any further. And this can be contrary to no man's reason, although the knowledge of it is hid from him.

But there is another difficulty of great importance among those who quarrel with the doctrine of the Trinity, as well as with several other articles of Christianity; which is, that our religion abounds in mysteries, and these they are so bold as to revile as cant, imposture, and priestcraft. It is impossible for us to determine for what reasons God thought fit to communicate some things to us in part, and leave some part a mystery; but so it is in fact, and so the Holy Scriptures tell us in several places; for instance, the resurrection and change of our bodies are called mysteries by St Paul; our Saviour's incarnation is another: the kingdom of God is called a mystery by our Saviour, to be only known to His disciples; so is faith and the word of God by St Paul. I omit many others. So that to declare against all mysteries, without distinction or exception, is to declare against the whole tenor of the New Testament.

There are two conditions that may bring a mystery under suspicion. First, when it is not taught and commanded in Holy Writ; or, secondly, when the mystery turns to the advantage of those who preach it to others. Now, as to the first, it can never be said that we preach mysteries without warrant from holy Scripture, although I confess this, if the Trinity may have sometimes been explained by human invention, which might perhaps better have been spared. As to the second, it will not be possible to charge the Protestant priesthood with proposing any temporal advantage to themselves by broaching, or multiplying, or preaching of mysteries. Does this mystery of the Trinity, for instance, and the descent of the Holy Ghost bring the least profit or power to the preachers? No; it is as great a mystery to themselves as it is to the meanest of their hearers; and may be rather a cause of humiliation, by putting their understanding in that point upon a level with the most ignorant of their flock. It is true, indeed, the Roman Church hath very much enriched herself by trading in mysteries, for which they have not the least authority from Scripture, and which were fitted only to advance their own temporal wealth and grandeur, such as transubstantiation, the worshipping of images, indulgences for sins, purgatory, and masses for the dead, with many more. But it is the perpetual talent of those who have ill-will to our Church, or a contempt for all religion, taken up by the wickedness of their lives, to charge us with the errors and corruptions of Popery, which all Protestants have thrown off near two hundred years; whereas, those mysteries held by us have no prospect of power, pomp, or wealth, but have been ever maintained by the universal body of true believers from the days of the apostles, and will be so to the resurrection; neither will the gates of hell prevail against them.

It may be thought, perhaps, a strange thing that God should require us to believe mysteries, while the reason or manner of what we are to believe is above our comprehension, and wholly concealed from us; neither doth it appear at first sight that the believing or not believing them doth concern either the glory of God or contribute to the goodness or wickedness of our lives. But this is a great and dangerous mistake. We see what a mighty weight is laid upon faith both in the Old and New Testament. In the former we read how the faith of Abraham is praised. Who could believe that God would raise from him a great nation, at the very same time that he was commanded to sacrifice his only son and despair of any other issue? And this was to him a great mystery. Our Saviour is perpetually preaching faith to His disciples, or reproaching them with the want of it; and St Paul produceth numerous examples of the wonders done

by faith. And all this is highly reasonable; for faith is an entire dependence upon the truth, the power, the justice, and the mercy of God, which dependence will certainly incline us to obey Him in all things. So that the great excellency of faith consisteth in the consequence it hath upon our actions; as, if we depend upon the truth and wisdom of a man, we shall certainly be more disposed to follow his advice. Therefore, let no man think that he can lead as good a moral life without faith as with it; for this reason, because he who hath no faith cannot by the strength of his own reason or endeavours so easily resist temptation as the other who depends upon God's assistance in the overcoming his frailties, and is sure to be rewarded for ever in heaven for his victory over them. Faith, says the apostle, is the evidence of things not seen. He means that faith is a virtue by which everything commanded us by God to believe appears evident and certain to us, although we do not see it, nor can conceive it; because, by faith, we entirely depend upon the truth and power of God.

It is an old and true distinction that things may be above our reason without being contrary to it. Of this kind are the power, the nature, and the universal presence of God, with innumerable other points. How little do those who quarrel with mysteries know of the commonest actions of nature? The growth of an animal, of a plant, or of the smallest seed, is a mystery to the wisest among men. If an ignorant person were told that a loadstone would draw iron at a distance, he might say it was a thing contrary to his reason, and could not believe it before he saw it with his eyes.

The manner whereby the soul and body are united and how they are distinguished is wholly unaccountable to us. We see but one part, and yet we know we consist of two; and this is a mystery we cannot comprehend any more than that of the Trinity.

From what hath been said it is manifest that God did never command us to believe, nor His ministers to preach, any doctrine which is contrary to the reason He hath pleased to endow us with; but, for His own wise ends, has thought fit to conceal from us the nature of the thing He commands, thereby to try our faith and obedience, and increase our dependence upon Him.

It is highly probable that if God should please to reveal unto us this great mystery of the Trinity, or some other mysteries in our holy religion, we should not be able to understand them, unless He would at the same time think fit to bestow on us some new powers or faculties of the mind, which we want at present, and are reserved till the day of resurrection to life eternal. "For now," as the apostle says, "we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face."

Thus we see the matter is brought to this issue; we must either believe what God directly commandeth us in Holy Scripture, or we must wholly reject the Scripture and the Christian religion which we pretend to profess. But this, I hope, is too desperate a step for any of us to make.

SIR ROBERT WALPOLE*

1676-1745.

ON A MOTION FOR ADDRESSING THE KING FOR HIS REMOVAL.†

[SANDYS, the leader of the opposition against Walpole, made a long speech to the effect that Walpole had been at the head of affairs for twenty years, and that the people were tired of him as a minister, and hated him as a man; he concluded by moving "that an humble address be presented to his Majesty, that he would be graciously pleased to remove the Right Honourable Sir Robert Walpole, Knight of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, First Commissioner for executing the office of Treasurer of the Exchequer, Chancellor and Under Treasurer of the Exchequer, and one of his Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, from his Majesty's presence and councils for ever."]

It has been observed by several gentlemen, in vindication of this motion, that if it should be carried, neither my life, liberty, nor estate will be affected. But do the honourable gentlemen consider my character and reputation as of no moment? Is it no imputation to be arraigned before this House, in which I have sat forty years, and to have my name transmitted to posterity with disgrace and infamy? I will not conceal my sentiments, that to be *named* in Par-

---

* "The age of Walpole was an age rather of keen debate than impassioned eloquence. . . . They were emphatically business speakers, eagerly intent upon their object, but destitute of any principles or feelings which could raise them above the level of most selfish minds, engaged for a desperate struggle for office and power."—*C. A. Goodrich.*

† A speech delivered in the House of Commons, February 1741.

liament as a subject of inquiry, is to me a matter of great concern. But I have the satisfaction, at the same time, to reflect, that the impression to be made depends upon the consistency of the charge and the motives of the prosecutors.

Had the charge been reduced to specific allegations, I should have felt myself called upon for a specific defence. Had I served a weak or wicked master, and implicitly obeyed his dictates, obedience to his commands must have been my only justification. But as it has been my good fortune to serve a master who wants no bad ministers, and would have hearkened to none, my defence must rest on my own conduct. The consciousness of innocence is also a sufficient support against my present prosecutors. A further justification is derived from a consideration of the views and abilities of the prosecutors. Had I been guilty of great enormities, they want neither zeal and inclination to bring them forward, nor ability to place them in the most prominent point of view. But as I am conscious of no crime, my own experience convinces me that none can be justly imputed.

I must therefore ask the gentlemen, From whence does this attack proceed? From the passions and prejudices of the parties combined against me, who may be divided into three classes, the Boys, the riper Patriots, and the Tories.* The Tories I can easily forgive. They have unwillingly come into the measure; and they do me honour in thinking it necessary to remove me, as their only obstacle. What, then, is the inference to be drawn from these premises? That demerit with my opponents ought to be considered as merit with others. But my great and principal crime is my long continuance in office; or, in other words, the long exclusion of those who now complain against me. This is the heinous offence which exceeds all others. I keep from them the possession of that power, those honours, and those emoluments, to which they so ardently and pertinaciously aspire. I will not attempt to deny the reasonableness and necessity of a party war; but, in carrying on that war, all principles and rules of justice should not be departed from. The Tories must confess that the most obnoxious persons have felt few instances of extra-judicial power. Wherever they have been arraigned, a plain charge has been exhibited against them. They have had an impartial trial, and have been permitted to make their defence. And will they, who have experienced this fair and equitable mode of proceeding, act in direct opposition to every principle of justice, and establish this fatal precedent of parliamentary inquisition? Whom would they conciliate by a conduct so contrary to principle and precedent.

Can it be fitting in them [the Tories], who have divided the public opinion of the nation, to share it with those who now appear as their competitors? With the men of yesterday, the boys in politics, who would be absolutely contemptible did not their audacity render them detestable? With the mock patriots, whose practice and professions prove their selfishness and malignity; who threatened to pursue me to destruction, and who have never for a moment lost sight of their object? These men, under the name of Separatists, presume to call themselves exclusively the *nation* and the *people*, and under that character assume all power. In their estimation, the King, Lords, and Commons are a faction, and *they* are the Government. Upon these principles they threaten the destruction of all authority, and think they have a right to judge, direct, and resist all legal magistrates. They withdraw from Parliament because they succeed in nothing; and then attribute their want of success, not to its true cause, their own want of integrity and importance, but to the effect of places, pensions, and corruption. May it not be asked on this point, Are the people on the Court side more united than on the other? Are not the Tories, Jacobites, and Patriots equally determined? What makes this strict union? What cements this heterogeneous mass? Party engagements and personal attachments. However different their views and principles, they all agree in opposition. The Jacobites distress the government they would subvert; the Tories contend for party prevalence and power. The Patriots, from discontent and disappointment, would change the ministry, that themselves may exclusively succeed. They have laboured this point twenty years unsuccessfully. They are impatient of longer delay. They clamour for change of measures, but mean only change of ministers.

In party contests, why should not both sides be equally steady? Does not a Whig administration as well deserve the support of the Whigs as the contrary? Why is not *principle* the cement in one as well as the other; especially when my opponents confess that all is levelled against one man? Why this one man? Because they think, vainly, nobody else could withstand them. All others are treated as tools and vassals. The one is the corrupter; the numbers corrupted. But whence this cry of corruption, and exclusive claim of honourable distinction? Compare the estates, characters, and fortunes of the Commons on one side with those on the other. Let the matter be fairly investigated. Survey and examine the individuals who usually support the measures of government, and those who are in

* "The colleagues whom, one by one, his jealousy had dismissed, had plunged, with the exception of Townshend, into an opposition more factious and unprincipled than had ever disgraced English politics; and these Patriots were now reinforced by a band of younger Whigs, the 'Boys,' as Walpole called them, whose temper revolted alike against the peace and corruption of his policy, and at whose head stood a young cornet of horse, William Pitt."—*J. R. Green.*

opposition. Let us see to whose side the balance preponderates. Look round both Houses, and see to which side the balance of virtue and talents preponderates! Are all these on one side, and not on the other? Or are all these to be counterbalanced by an affected claim to the exclusive title of patriotism? Gentlemen have talked a great deal of patriotism. A venerable word, when duly practised. But I am sorry to say that of late it has been so much hackneyed about, that it is in danger of falling into disgrace. The very idea of true patriotism is lost, and the term has been prostituted to the very worst of purposes. A patriot, sir! Why, patriots spring up like mushrooms! I could raise fifty of them within the four-and-twenty hours. I have raised many of them in one night. It is but refusing to gratify an unreasonable or an insolent demand, and up starts a patriot. I have never been afraid of making patriots; but I disdain and despise all their efforts. This pretended virtue proceeds from personal malice and disappointed ambition. There is not a man among them whose particular aim I am not able to ascertain, and from what motive they have entered into the lists of opposition.

I shall now consider the articles of accusation which they have brought against me, and which they have not thought fit to reduce to specific charges; and I shall consider these in the same order as that in which they were placed by the honourable member who made the motion. First, in regard to foreign affairs; secondly, to domestic affairs; and, thirdly, to the conduct of the war.

1. As to foreign affairs, I must take notice of the uncandid manner in which the gentlemen on the other side have managed the question, by blending numerous treaties and complicated negotiations into one general mass.

To form a fair and candid judgment of the subject, it becomes necessary not to consider the treaties merely *insulated*, but to advert to the time in which they were made, to the circumstances and situation of Europe when they were made, to the peculiar situation in which I stand, and to the power which I possessed. I am called repeatedly and insidiously prime and sole minister. Admitting, however, for the sake of argument, that I am prime and sole minister in this country, am I, therefore, prime and sole minister of all Europe? Am I answerable for the conduct of other countries as well as for that of my own? Many words are not wanting to show that the particular view of each court occasioned the dangers which affected the public tranquillity; yet the whole is charged to my account. Nor is this sufficient. Whatever was the conduct of England, I am equally arraigned. If we maintained ourselves in peace, and took no share in foreign transactions, we are reproached for tameness and pusillanimity. If, on the contrary, we interfered in these disputes, we are called Don Quixotes, and dupes to all the world. If we contracted guarantees it was asked, Why is the nation wantonly burdened? If guarantees were declined, we were reproached with having no allies.

I have, however, sir, this advantage, that all the objections now alleged against the conduct of the administration to which I have the honour to belong, have already been answered to the satisfaction of a majority of both Houses of Parliament, and I believe to the satisfaction of a majority of the better sort of people in the nation. I need, therefore, only repeat a few of these answers that have been made already, which I shall do in the order of time in which the several transactions happened; and consequently must begin with our refusing to accept of the sole mediation offered us by Spain, on the breach between that court and the court of France, occasioned by the dismission of the Infanta of Spain.

I hope it will not be said we had any reason to quarrel with France upon that account; and therefore, if our accepting of that mediation might have produced a rupture with France, it was not our duty to interfere unless we had something very beneficial to expect from the acceptance. A reconciliation between the courts of Vienna and Madrid, it is true, was desirable to all Europe as well as to us, provided it had been brought about without any design to disturb our tranquillity or the tranquillity of Europe. But both parties were then so high in their demands that we could hope for no success; and if the negotiation had ended without effect, we might have expected the common fate of arbitrators, the disobliging of both. Therefore, as it was our interest to keep well with both, I must still think it was the most prudent part we could act to refuse the offered mediation.

The next step of our foreign conduct, exposed to reprehension, is the Treaty of Hanover.* Sir, if I were to give the true history of that treaty, which no gentleman can desire I should, I am sure I could fully justify my own conduct. But as I do not desire to justify my own without justifying his late Majesty's conduct, I must ob-

* "Spain now turned her resentment against England, and settled her differences with the Emperor of Germany on terms so favourable to the latter, as to awaken suspicions (which were confirmed by secret intelligence) that some hidden compact had been made for conjointly attacking the dominions of England. To counteract this, England, in 1725, united with France, Prussia, Denmark, and Holland, in an opposing league, by a compact called the Treaty of Hanover, from the place where it was made. The evidence of these facts could not then be brought forward to defend the ministry; and hence the Treaty of Hanover, and the consequent expenditures on the Continent, were extremely unpopular in England. But subsequent disclosures have made it nearly or quite certain, that everything here alleged by Walpole was strictly true."—*C. A. Goodrich.*

serve that his late Majesty had such information as convinced not only him, but those of his council, both at home and abroad, that some dangerous designs had been formed between the emperor and Spain at the time of their concluding the treaty at Vienna, in May 1725; designs, sir, which were dangerous not only to the liberties of this nation, but to the liberties of Europe. They were not only to wrest Gibraltar and Port Mahon from this nation, and force the Pretender upon us; but they were to have Don Carlos married to the emperor's eldest daughter, who would thereby have had a probability of uniting in his person, or in the person of some of his successors the crowns of France and Spain, with the imperial dignity and the Austrian dominions. It was therefore highly reasonable, both in France and us, to take the alarm at such designs, and to think betimes of preventing their being carried into execution. But with regard to us, it was more particularly our business to take the alarm, because we were to have been immediately attacked. I shall grant, sir, it would have been very difficult, if not impossible, for Spain and the emperor joined together, to have invaded or made themselves masters of any of the British dominions. But will it be said they might not have invaded the king's dominions in Germany, in order to force him to a compliance with what they desired of him as King of Great Britain? And if those dominions had been invaded on account of a quarrel with this nation, should we not have been obliged, both in honour and interest to defend them? When we were thus threatened, it was therefore absolutely necessary for us to make an alliance with France; and that we might not trust too much to their assistance, it was likewise necessary to form alliances with the northern powers, and with some of the princes in Germany, which we never did, nor ever could do, without granting them immediate subsidies. These measures were, therefore, I still think, not only prudent, but necessary; and by these measures we made it much more dangerous for the emperor and Spain to attack us than it would otherwise have been.

But still, sir, though by these alliances we put ourselves upon an equal footing with our enemies in case of an attack, yet, in order to preserve the tranquillity of Europe as well as our own, there was something else to be done. We knew that war could not be begun and carried on without money; we knew that the emperor had no money for that purpose without receiving large remittances from Spain; and we knew that Spain could make no such remittances without receiving large returns of treasure from the West Indies. The only way, therefore, to render these two powers incapable of disturbing the tranquillity of Europe, was by sending a squadron to the West Indies to stop the return of the Spanish galleons; and this made it necessary, at the same time, to send a squadron to the Mediterranean for the security of our valuable possessions in that part of the world. By these measures the emperor saw the impossibility of attacking us in any part of the world, because Spain could give him no assistance either in money or troops; and the attack made by the Spaniards upon Gibraltar was so feeble, that we had no occasion to call upon our allies for assistance. A small squadron of our own prevented their attacking it by sea, and from their attack by land we had nothing to fear. They might have knocked their brains out against inaccessible rocks to this very day, without bringing that fortress into any danger.

I do not pretend, sir, to be a great master of foreign affairs. In that post in which I have the honour to serve his Majesty, it is not my business to interfere; and as one of his Majesty's council, I have but one voice. But if I had been the sole adviser of the Treaty of Hanover, and of all the measures which were taken in pursuance of it, from what I have said I hope it will appear that I do not deserve to be censured either as a weak or a wicked minister on that account.

The next measures which incurred censure were the guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction by the second Treaty of Vienna, and the refusal of the cabinet to assist the house of Austria, in conformity with the articles of that guarantee.*

As to the guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction I am really surprised to find that measure objected to. It was so universally approved of, both within doors and without, that till this very day I think no fault was ever found with it, unless it was that of being too long delayed. If it was so necessary for supporting the balance of power in Europe, as has been insisted on in this debate, to preserve entire the dominions of the house of Austria, surely it was not our business to insist upon a partition of them in favour of any of the princes of the empire. But if we had, could we have expected that the house of Austria would have agreed to any such partition even for the acquisition of our guarantee? The King of Prussia had, it is true, a claim upon some lordships in Silesia; but that claim was absolutely denied by the court of Vienna, and was not at that time so much insisted on by the late King of Prussia. Nay, if he had lived till this time, I believe it would not now have been insisted on; for he acceded to that guarantee without any reservation of that claim; therefore I must look upon this as an objection which has since arisen from an accident that could not then be foreseen or provided against.

I must therefore think, sir, that our guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction, or our manner of doing it, cannot now be objected to, nor any

* In allusion to the instrument drawn up by Charles VI. of Germany, called a Pragmatic Sanction, by which all his hereditary estates were to go to his female descendants.

person censured by Parliament for advising that measure. In regard to the refusal of the cabinet to assist the house of Austria, though it was prudent and right in us to enter into that guarantee, we were not therefore obliged to enter into every broil the house of Austria might afterward lead themselves into. And therefore we were not in honour obliged to take any share in the war which the emperor brought upon himself in the year 1733; nor were we in interest obliged to take a share in that war as long as neither side attempted to push their conquests further than was consistent with the balance of power in Europe, which was a case that did not happen. For the power of the house of Austria was not diminished by the event of that war, because they got Tuscany, Parma, and Placentia in lieu of Naples and Sicily; nor was the power of France much increased, because Lorraine was a province she had taken and kept possession of during every war in which she had been engaged.

As to the disputes with Spain, they had not then reached such a height as to make it necessary for us to come to an open rupture. We had then reason to hope, that all differences would be accommodated in an amicable manner; and while we have any such hopes, it can never be prudent for us to engage ourselves in war, especially with Spain, where we have always had a very beneficial commerce. These hopes, it is true, sir, at last proved abortive; but I never heard it was a crime to hope for the best. This sort of hope was the cause of the late Convention. If Spain had performed her part of that preliminary treaty, I am sure it would not have been wrong in us to have hoped for a friendly accommodation; and for that end to have waited nine or ten months longer, in which time the plenipotentiaries were, by the treaty, to have adjusted all the differences subsisting between the two nations. But the failure of Spain in performing what had been agreed to by this preliminary put an end to all our hopes, and then, and not till then, it became prudent to enter into hostilities, which were commenced as soon as possible after the expiration of the term limited for the payment of the £95,000.

Strong and virulent censures have been cast on me for having commenced the war without a single ally; and this deficiency has been ascribed to the multifarious treaties in which I have bewildered myself. But although the authors of this imputation are well apprised that all these treaties have been submitted to and approved by Parliament, yet they are now brought forward as crimes, without appealing to the judgment of Parliament, and without proving or declaring that all or any of them were advised by me. A supposed sole minister is to be condemned and punished as the author of all; and what adds to the enormity is, that an attempt was made to convict him uncharged and unheard, without taking into consideration the most arduous crisis which ever occurred in the annals of Europe. Sweden corrupted by France; Denmark tempted and wavering; the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel almost gained; the King of Prussia, the Emperor, and the Czarina, with whom alliances had been negotiating, dead; the Austrian dominions claimed by Spain and Bavaria; the Elector of Saxony hesitating whether he should accede to the general confederacy planned by France; the court of Vienna irresolute and indecisive. In this critical juncture, if France enters into engagements with Prussia, and if the Queen of Hungary hesitates and listens to France, are all or any of those events to be imputed to English counsels? And if to English counsels, why are they to be attributed to one man?

2. I now come, sir, to the second head, the conduct of domestic affairs. And here a most heinous charge is made, that the nation has been burdened with unnecessary expenses, for the sole purpose of preventing the discharge of our debts and the abolition of taxes. But this attack is more to the dishonour of the whole cabinet council than to me. If there is any ground for this imputation, it is a charge upon king, Lords, and Commons, as corrupted or imposed upon. And they have no *proof* of these allegations, but affect to substantiate them by common fame and public notoriety!

No expense has been incurred but what has been approved of, and provided for, by Parliament. The public treasure has been duly applied to the uses to which it was appropriated by Parliament, and regular accounts have been annually laid before Parliament of every article of expense. If by foreign accidents, by the disputes of foreign states among themselves, or by their designs against us, the nation has often been put to an extraordinary expense, that expense cannot be said to have been unnecessary; because, if by saving it we had exposed the balance of power to danger, or ourselves to an attack, it would have cost, perhaps, a hundred times that sum before we could recover from that danger, or repel that attack.

In all such cases there will be a variety of opinions. I happened to be one of those who thought all these expenses necessary, and I had the good fortune to have the majority of both Houses of Parliament on my side. But this, it seems, proceeded from bribery and corruption. Sir, if any one instance had been mentioned, if it had been shown that I ever offered a reward to any member of either House, or ever threatened to deprive any member of his office or employment, in order to influence his vote in Parliament, there might have been some ground for this charge. But when it is so generally laid, I do not know what I can say to it, unless it be to deny it as generally and as positively as it has been asserted. And, thank God! till some

proof be offered, I have the laws of the land, as well as the laws of charity, in my favour.

Some members of both Houses have, it is true, been removed from their employments under the Crown; but were they ever told, either by me, or by any other of his Majesty's servants, that it was for opposing the measures of the administration in Parliament? They were removed because his Majesty did not think fit to continue them longer in his service. His Majesty had a right so to do; and I know no one that has a right to ask him, "What doest thou?" If his Majesty had a mind that the favours of the Crown should circulate, would not this of itself be a good reason for removing any of his servants? Would not this reason be approved of by the whole nation, except those who happen to be the present possessors? I cannot, therefore, see how this can be imputed as a crime, or how any of the king's ministers can be blamed for his doing what the public has no concern in: for if the public be well and faithfully served, it has no business to ask by whom.

As to the particular charge urged against me, I mean that of the army debentures, I am surprised, sir, to hear anything relating to this affair charged upon me. Whatever blame may attach to this affair, it must be placed to the account of those that were in power when I was, as they call it, the country gentleman.* It was by them this affair was introduced and conducted, and I came in only to pay off those public securities, which their management had reduced to a great discount; and consequently to redeem our public credit from that reproach which they had brought upon it. The discount at which these army debentures were negotiated was a strong and prevalent reason with Parliament to apply the sinking fund first to the payment of those debentures; but the sinking fund could not be applied to that purpose till it began to produce something considerable, which was not till the year 1727. That the sinking fund was then to receive a great addition, was a fact publicly known in 1726; and if some people were sufficiently quick-sighted to foresee that the Parliament would probably make this use of it, and cunning enough to make the most of their own foresight, could I help it, or could they be blamed for doing so? But I defy my most inveterate enemy to prove that I had any hand in *bringing* these debentures to a discount, or that I had any share in the profits by *buying* them up.

In reply to those who confidently assert that the national debt is not decreased since 1727, and that the sinking fund has not been applied to the discharge of the public burdens, I can with truth declare, that a part of the debt *has* been paid off; and the landed interest has been very much eased with respect to that most unequal and grievous burden, the land tax. I say so, sir, because upon examination it will appear, that within these sixteen or seventeen years no less than £8,000,000 of our debt has been actually discharged by the due application of the sinking fund; and at least £7,000,000 has been taken from that fund, and applied to the ease of the land tax. For if it had not been applied to the current service, we must have supplied that service by increasing the land tax; and as the sinking fund was originally designed for paying off our debts, and easing us of our taxes, the application of it in ease of the land tax was certainly as proper and necessary a use as could be made. And I little thought that giving relief to landed gentlemen would have been brought against me as a crime.

3. I shall now advert to the third topic of accusation—the conduct of the war. I have already stated in what manner, and under what circumstances, hostilities commenced; and as I am neither general nor admiral—as I have nothing to do either with our navy or army—I am sure I am not answerable for the prosecution of it. But were I to answer for everything, no fault could, I think, be found with my conduct in the prosecution of the war. It has from the beginning been carried on with as much vigour, and as great care of our trade, as was consistent with our safety at home, and with the circumstances we were in at the beginning of the war. If our attacks upon the enemy were too long delayed, or if they have not been so vigorous or so frequent as they ought to have been, those only are to blame who have for many years been haranguing against standing armies; for, without a sufficient number of regular troops in proportion to the numbers kept up by our neighbours, I am sure we can neither defend ourselves nor offend our enemies. On the supposed miscarriages of the war, so unfairly stated, and so unjustly imputed to me, I could, with great ease, frame an incontrovertible defence. But as I have trespassed so long on the time of the House, I shall not weaken the effect of that forcible exculpation so generously and disinterestedly advanced by the right honourable gentleman who so meritoriously presides at the Admiralty.

If my whole administration is to be scrutinised and arraigned, why are the most favourable parts to be omitted? If facts are to be accumulated on one side, why not on the other? And why may not I be permitted to speak in my own favour? Was I not called by the voice of the king and the nation to remedy the fatal effects of the South Sea project, and to support declining credit? Was I not placed at the head of the treasury when the revenues were in the greatest confusion? Is credit revived, and does it now flourish? Is it not at an incredible height? and if so, to whom must that circumstance be attributed? Has not tranquillity been preserved

* One who held himself bound to neither party.

both at home and abroad, notwithstanding a most unreasonable and violent opposition? Has the true interest of the nation been pursued, or has trade flourished? Have gentlemen produced one instance of this exorbitant power; of the influence which I extend to all parts of the nation; of the tyranny with which I oppress those who oppose, and the liberality with which I reward those who support me? But having first invested me with a kind of mock dignity, and styled me a prime minister, they impute to me an unpardonable abuse of that chimerical authority which they only have created and conferred. If they are really persuaded that the army is annually established by me, that I have the sole disposal of posts and honours, that I employ this power in the destruction of liberty and the diminution of commerce, let me awaken them from their delusion. Let me expose to their view the real condition of the public weal. Let me show them that the Crown has made no encroachments, that all supplies have been granted by Parliament, that all questions have been debated with the same freedom as before the fatal period in which my counsels are said to have gained the ascendancy—an ascendancy from which they deduce the loss of trade, the approach of slavery, the preponderance of prerogative, and the extension of influence. But I am far from believing that they feel those apprehensions which they so earnestly labour to communicate to others; and I have too high an opinion of their sagacity not to conclude that, even in their own judgment, they are complaining of grievances that they do not suffer, and promoting rather their private interest than that of the public.

What is this unbounded sole power which is imputed to me? How has it discovered itself, or how has it been proved?

What have been the effects of the corruption, ambition, and avarice with which I am so abundantly charged?

Have I ever been suspected of being corrupted? A strange phenomenon, a corrupter himself not corrupt! Is ambition imputed to me? Why then do I still continue a commoner? I, who refused a white staff and a peerage? I had, indeed, like to have forgotten the little ornament about my shoulders [the garter], which gentlemen have so repeatedly mentioned in terms of sarcastic obloquy. But surely, though this may be regarded with envy or indignation in another place, it cannot be supposed to raise any resentment in *this* House, where many may be pleased to see those honours which their ancestors have worn, restored again to the Commons.

Have I given any symptoms of an avaricious disposition? Have I obtained any grants from the Crown since I have been placed at the head of the treasury? Has my conduct been different from that which others in the same station would have followed? Have I acted wrong in giving the place of auditor to my son, and in providing for my own family? I trust that their advancement will not be imputed to me as a crime, unless it shall be proved that I placed them in offices of trust and responsibility for which they were unfit.

But while I unequivocally deny that I am sole and prime minister, and that to my influence and direction all the measures of the Government must be attributed, yet I will not shrink from the responsibility which attaches to the post I have the honour to hold; and should, during the long period in which I have sat upon this bench, any one step taken by Government be proved to be either disgraceful or disadvantageous to the nation, I am ready to hold myself accountable.

To conclude, sir, though I shall always be proud of the honour of any trust or confidence from his Majesty, yet I shall always be ready to remove from his councils and presence when he thinks fit; and therefore I should think myself very little concerned in the event of the present question, if it were not for the encroachment that will thereby be made upon the prerogatives of the Crown. But I must think that an address to his Majesty to remove one of his servants, without so much as alleging any particular crime against him, is one of the greatest encroachments that was ever made upon the prerogatives of the Crown. And therefore, for the sake of my master, without any regard for my own, I hope all those that have a due regard for our constitution, and for the rights and prerogatives of the Crown, without which our constitution cannot be preserved, will be against this motion.

[At the time this speech had a great effect, and the motion for an address was negatived, but the tide of popular favour having set in against him, he was compelled to resign all his offices on the 11th of February 1742.]

WILLIAM PULTENEY.

1682-1764.

ON A MOTION FOR REDUCING THE ARMY. *

SIR,—We have heard a great deal about Parliamentary armies, and about an army continued from year to year. I have always been, sir, and always shall be, against a standing army of any kind. To me it is a terrible thing, whether under that of parliamentary or any other designation. A standing army is still a standing army, whatever name it be called by. They are a body of men distinct from the body of the people; they are governed by different laws; and blind obedience, and an entire submission to the orders of their commanding officer, is their only principle. The nations around us, sir, are already enslaved, and have been enslaved by these very means: by means of their standing armies they have every one lost their liberties. It is indeed impossible that the liberties of the people can be preserved in any country where a numerous standing army is kept up. Shall we, then, take any of our measures from the examples of our neighbours? No, sir, on the contrary, from their misfortunes we ought to learn to avoid those rocks upon which they have split.

It signifies nothing to tell me that our army is commanded by such gentlemen as cannot be supposed to join in any measures for enslaving their country. It may be so. I hope it is so! I have a very good opinion of many gentlemen now in the army. I believe they would not join in any such measures. But their lives are uncertain, nor can we be sure how long they may be continued in command; they may be all dismissed in a moment, and proper tools of power put in their room. Besides, sir, we know the passions of men; we know how dangerous it is to trust the best of men with too much power. Where was there a braver army than that under Julius Cæsar? Where was there ever an army that had served their country more faithfully? That army was commanded generally by the best citizens of Rome—by men of great fortune and figure in their country? yet *that* army enslaved their country. The affections of the soldiers toward their country, the honour and integrity of the under officers, are not to be depended on. By the military law, the administration of justice is so quick, and the punishments so severe, that neither officer nor soldier dares offer to dispute the orders of his supreme commander; he must not consult his own inclinations. If an officer were commanded to pull his own father out of this House, he must do it; he dares not disobey; immediate death would be the sure consequence of the least grumbling. And if an officer were sent into the Court of Requests, accompanied by a body of musketeers with screwed bayonets, and with orders to tell us what we ought to do, and how we were to vote, I know what would be the duty of this House; I know it would be our duty to order the officer to be taken and hanged up at the door of the lobby. But, sir, I doubt much if such a spirit could be found in the House, or in any House of Commons that will ever be in England.

Sir, I talk not of imaginary things. I talk of what *has* happened to an English House of Commons, and from an English army; and not only from an English army, but an army that was raised by that very House of Commons, an army that was paid by them, and an army that was commanded by generals appointed by them. Therefore do not let us vainly imagine that an army raised and maintained by authority of Parliament will always be submissive to them. If an army be so numerous as to have it in their power to overawe the Parliament, they will be submissive as long as the Parliament does nothing to disoblige their favourite general; but when that case happens, I am afraid that in place of Parliament's dismissing the army, the army will dismiss the Parliament, as they have done heretofore. Nor does the legality or illegality of that Parliament, or of that army, alter the case. For with respect to that army, and according to their way of thinking, the Parliament dismissed by them was a legal Parliament; they were an army raised and maintained according to law; and at first they were raised, as they imagined, for the preservation of those liberties which they afterward destroyed.

It has been urged, sir, that whoever is for the Protestant succession must be for continuing the army: for that very reason, sir, I am against continuing the army. I know that neither the Protestant succession in his Majesty's most illustrious house, nor any succession, can ever be safe so long as there is a standing army in the country. Armies, sir, have no regard to hereditary successions. The first two Cæsars at Rome did pretty well, and found means to keep their armies in tolerable subjection, because the generals and officers were all their own creatures. But how did it fare with their successors? Was not every one of them named by the army, without any regard to hereditary right, or to any right? A cobbler, a gardener, or any man

* A speech delivered in the House of Commons.

SRI PRATAP COLLEGE LIBRARY
SRINAGAR

who happened to raise himself in the army, and could gain their affections, was made emperor of the world. Was not every succeeding emperor raised to the throne, or tumbled headlong into the dust, according to the mere whim or mad frenzy of the soldiers?

We are told this army is desired to be continued but for one year longer, or for a limited term of years. How absurd is this distinction! Is there any army in the world continued for any term of years? Does the most absolute monarch tell his army, that he is to continue them any number of years, or any number of months? How long have we already continued our army from year to year? And if it thus continues, wherein will it differ from the standing armies of those countries which have already submitted their necks to the yoke? We are now come to the Rubicon. Our army is now to be reduced, or never will. From his Majesty's own mouth we are assured of a profound tranquillity abroad, and we know there is one at home. If this is not a proper time, if these circumstances do not afford us a safe opportunity for reducing at least a part of our regular forces, we never can expect to see any reduction. This nation, already overburdened with debts and taxes, must be loaded with the heavy charge of perpetually supporting a numerous standing army; and remain for ever exposed to the danger of having its liberties and privileges trampled upon by any future king or ministry, who shall take in their head to do so, and shall take a proper care to model the army for that purpose.

PHILIP DORMER STANHOPE,

LORD CHESTERFIELD.

1694-1773.

THE GIN ACT.*

THE bill now under our consideration appears to me to deserve a much closer regard than seems to have been paid to it in the other House, through which it was hurried with the utmost precipitation, and where it passed almost without the formality of a debate. Nor can I think that earnestness with which some lords seem inclined to press it forward here consistent with the importance of the consequences which may with great reason be expected from it.

To desire, my Lords, that this bill may be considered in a committee, is only to desire that it may gain one step without opposition, that it may proceed through the forms of the House by stealth, and that the consideration of it may be delayed till the exigencies of the Government shall be so great as not to allow time for raising the supplies by any other method.

By this artifice, gross as it is, the patrons of this wonderful bill hope to obstruct a plain and open detection of its tendency. They hope, my Lords, that the bill shall operate in the same manner with the liquor which it is intended to bring into more general use; and that, as those who drink spirits are drunk before they are well aware that they are drinking, the effects of this law shall be perceived before we know that we have made it. Their intent is to give us a dram of policy, which is to be swallowed before it is tasted, and which, when once it is swallowed, will turn our heads.

But, my Lords, I hope we shall be so cautious as to examine the draught which these state empirics have thought proper to offer us; and I am confident that a very little examination will convince us of the pernicious qualities of their new preparation, and show that it can have no other effect than that of poisoning the public.

The law before us, my Lords, seems to be the effect of that practice of which it is intended likewise to be the cause, and to be dictated by the liquor of which it so effectually promotes the use; for surely it never before was conceived, by any man entrusted with the administration of public affairs, to raise taxes by the destruction of the people.

Nothing, my Lords, but the destruction of all the most laborious and useful part of the nation can be expected from the licence which is now proposed to be given, not only to drunkenness, but to drunkenness of the most detestable and dangerous kind; to the abuse not only of intoxicating, but of poisonous liquors.

Nothing, my Lords, is more absurd than to assert that the use of spirits will be hindered by the bill now before us, or indeed that it will not be in a very great degree promoted by it. For what produces all kind of wickedness but the prospect of impunity on one part, or the solicitation of opportunity on the other? Either of these have too frequently been sufficient to overpower the sense of morality, and even of religion; and what is not to be feared from them

* A speech delivered in the House of Lords, February 21, 1743, on a bill for granting licences to ginshops. By the revenue thus gained it was proposed to carry on the German war of George II.

when they shall unite their force and operate together, when temptations shall be increased, and terror taken away?

It is allowed by those who have hitherto disputed on either side of this question, that the people appear obstinately enamoured of this new liquor. It is allowed on both parts that this liquor corrupts the mind and enervates the body, and destroys vigour and virtue, at the same time that it makes those who drink it too idle and feeble for work; and, while it impoverishes them by the present expense, disables them from retrieving its ill consequences by subsequent industry.

It might be imagined, my Lords, that those who had thus far agreed would not easily find any occasions of dispute. Nor would any man, unacquainted with the motives by which parliamentary debates are too often influenced, suspect that after the pernicious qualities of this liquor, and the general inclination among the people to the immoderate use of it, had been thus fully admitted, it could be afterward inquired whether it ought to be made more common; whether this universal thirst for poison ought to be encouraged by the Legislature, and whether a new statute ought to be made to secure drunkards in the gratification of their appetites.

To pretend, my Lords, that the design of this bill is to prevent or diminish the use of spirits, is to trample upon common sense, and to violate the rules of decency as well as of reason. For when did any man hear that a commodity was prohibited by licensing its sale, or that to offer and refuse is the same action?

It is indeed pleaded that it will be made dearer by the tax which is proposed, and that the increase of the price will diminish the number of the purchasers; but it is at the same time expected that this tax shall supply the expense of a war on the Continent. It is asserted, therefore, that the consumption of spirits will be hindered, and yet that it will be such as may be expected to furnish, from a very small tax, a revenue sufficient for the support of armies, for the re-establishment of the Austrian family, and the repressing of the attempts of France.

Surely, my Lords, these expectations are not very consistent; nor can it be imagined that they are both formed in the same head, though they may be expressed by the same mouth. It is, however, some recommendation of a statesman when, of his assertions, *one* can be found reasonable or true, and in this, praise cannot be denied to our present ministers. For though it is undoubtedly false that this tax will lessen the consumption of spirits, it is certainly true that it will produce a very large revenue—a revenue that will not fail but with the people from whose debaucheries it arises.

Our ministers will therefore have the same honour with their predecessors, of having given rise to a new fund; not indeed for the payment of our debts, but for much more valuable purposes; for the cheering of our hearts under oppression, and for the ready support of those debts which we have lost all hopes of paying. They are resolved, my Lords, that the nation which no endeavours can make wise, shall, while they are at its head, at least be very merry; and, since public happiness is the end of government, they seem to imagine that they shall deserve applause by an expedient which will enable every man to lay his cares asleep, to drown sorrow, and lose in the delights of drunkenness both the public miseries and his own.

Luxury, my Lords, is to be taxed, but vice prohibited, let the difficulties in executing the law be what they will. Would you lay a tax on the breach of the ten commandments? Would not such a tax be wicked and scandalous; because it would imply an indulgence to all those who could pay the tax? Is not this a reproach most justly thrown by Protestants upon the Church of Rome? Was it not the chief cause of the Reformation? And will you follow a precedent which brought reproach and ruin upon those that introduced it? This is the very case now before us. You are going to lay a tax, and consequently to indulge a sort of drunkenness, which almost necessarily produces a breach of every one of the ten commandments? Can you expect the reverend bench will approve of this? I am convinced they will not; and therefore I wish I had seen it full upon this occasion. I am sure I have seen it much fuller upon other occasions, in which religion had no such deep concern.

We have already, my Lords, several sorts of funds in this nation, so many that a man must have a good deal of learning to be master of them. Thanks to his Majesty, we have now among us the most learned man of the nation in this way. I wish he would rise up and tell us what name we are to give this new fund. We have already the Civil List Fund, the Sinking Fund, the Aggregate Fund, the South Sea Fund, and God knows how many others. What name we are to give this new fund I know not, unless we are to call it the Drinking Fund. It may perhaps enable the people of a certain foreign territory [Hanover] to drink claret, but it will disable the people of this kingdom from drinking anything else but gin; for when a man has, by gin drinking, rendered himself unfit for labour or business, he can purchase nothing else; and then the best thing he can do is to drink on till he dies.

Surely, my Lords, men of such unbounded benevolence as our present ministers deserve such honours as were never paid before; they deserve to bestride a butt upon every sign-post in the city, or to have their figures exhibited as tokens where this liquor is to be sold by the licence which they have procured. They must

be at least remembered to future ages as the "happy politicians" who, after all expedients for raising taxes had been employed, discovered a new method of draining the last relics of the public wealth, and added a new revenue to the Government. Nor will those who shall hereafter enumerate the several funds now established among us, forget, among the benefactors to their country, the illustrious authors of the Drinking Fund.

May I be allowed, my Lords, to congratulate my countrymen and fellow-subjects upon the happy times which are now approaching, in which no man will be disqualified from the privilege of being drunk; when all discontent and disloyalty will be forgotten, and the people, though now considered by the ministry as enemies, shall acknowledge the leniency of that government under which all restraints are taken away?

But, to a bill for such desirable purposes, it would be proper, my Lords, to prefix a preamble, in which the kindness of our intentions should be more fully explained, that the nation may not mistake our indulgence for cruelty, nor consider their benefactors as their persecutors. If, therefore, this bill be considered and amended (for why else should it be considered?) in a committee, I shall humbly propose that it shall be introduced in this manner: "Whereas, the designs of the present ministry, whatever they are, cannot be executed without a great number of mercenaries, which mercenaries cannot be hired without money; and whereas the present disposition of this nation to drunkenness inclines us to believe that they will pay more cheerfully for the undisturbed enjoyment of distilled liquors than for any other concession that can be made by the Government; be it enacted, by the King's most excellent Majesty, that no man shall hereafter be denied the right of being drunk on the following conditions."

This, my Lords, to trifle no longer, is the proper preamble to this bill, which contains only the conditions on which the people of this kingdom are to be allowed henceforward to riot in debauchery, in debauchery licensed by law and countenanced by the magistrates. For there is no doubt but those on whom the inventors of this tax shall confer authority, will be directed to assist their masters in their design to encourage the consumption of that liquor from which such large revenues are expected, and to multiply without end those licences which are to pay a yearly tribute to the Crown.

By this unbounded licence, my Lords, that price will be lessened, from the increase of which the expectations of the efficacy of this law are pretended; for the number of retailers will lessen the value, as in all other cases, and lessen it more than this tax will increase it. Besides, it is to be considered, that at present the retailer expects to be paid for the danger which he incurs by an unlawful trade, and will not trust his reputation or his purse to the mercy of his customer without a profit proportioned to the hazard; but, when once the restraint shall be taken away, he will sell for common gain, and it can hardly be imagined that, at present, he subjects himself to informations and penalties for less than sixpence a gallon.

The specious pretence on which this bill is founded, and, indeed, the only pretence that deserves to be termed specious, is the propriety of taxing vice; but this maxim of government has, on this occasion, been either mistaken or perverted. Vice, my Lords, is not properly to be taxed, but suppressed; and heavy taxes are sometimes the only means by which that suppression can be attained. Luxury, my Lords, or the excess of that which is pernicious only by its excess, may very properly be taxed, that such excess, though not strictly unlawful, may be made more difficult. But the use of those things which are simply hurtful, hurtful in their own nature, and in every degree, is to be prohibited. None, my Lords, ever heard, in any nation, of a tax upon theft or adultery, because a tax implies a licence granted for the use of that which is taxed to all who shall be willing to pay it. . . .

During the course of this long debate, I have endeavoured to recapitulate and digest the arguments which have been advanced, and have considered them both separately and conjointly; but find myself at the same distance from conviction as when I first entered the House.

In vindication of this bill, my Lords, we have been told that the present law is ineffectual; that our manufacture is not to be destroyed, or not this year; that the security offered by the present bill has induced great numbers to subscribe to the new fund; that it has been approved by the Commons; and that if it be found ineffectual, it may be amended another session.

All these arguments, my Lords, I shall endeavour to examine, because I am always desirous of gratifying those great men to whom the administration of affairs is entrusted, and have always very cautiously avoided the odium of disaffection, which they will undoubtedly throw, in imitation of their predecessors, upon all those whose wayward consciences shall oblige them to hinder the execution of their schemes.

With a very strong desire, therefore, though with no great hopes, of finding them in the right, I venture to begin my inquiry, and engage in the examination of their first assertion, that the present law against the abuse of strong liquors is without effect.

I hope, my Lords, it portends well to my inquiry that the first position which I have to examine is true; nor can I forbear to congratulate your Lordships upon having heard from the new ministry *one* assertion not to be contradicted.

It is evident, my Lords, from daily observation, and demonstrable from the papers upon the table, that every year, since the enacting of the last law, that vice has increased which it was intended to repress, and that no time has been so favourable to the retailers of spirits as that which has passed since they were prohibited.

It may therefore be expected, my Lords, that having agreed with the ministers in their fundamental proposition, I shall concur with them in the consequence which they draw from it; and having allowed that the present law is ineffectual, should admit that another is necessary.

But, my Lords, in order to discover whether this consequence be necessary, it must first be inquired why the present law is of no force. For, my Lords, it will be found, upon reflection, that there are certain degrees of corruption that may hinder the effect of the best laws. The magistrates may be vicious, and forbear to enforce that law by which themselves are condemned; they may be indolent, and inclined rather to connive at wickedness, by which they are not injured themselves, than to repress it by a laborious exertion of their authority; or they may be timorous, and, instead of awing the vicious, may be awed by them.

In any of these cases, my Lords, the law is not to be condemned for its inefficacy, since it only fails by the defect of those who are to direct its operations. The best and most important laws will contribute very little to the security or happiness of a people, if no judges of integrity and spirit can be found among them. Even the most beneficial and useful bill that ministers can possibly imagine, a bill for laying on our estates a tax of the fifth part of their yearly value, would be wholly without effect if collectors could not be obtained.

I am therefore, my Lords, yet doubtful whether the inefficacy of the law now subsisting necessarily obliges us to provide another; for those that declared it to be useless owned, at the same time, that no man endeavoured to enforce it, so that perhaps its only defect may be that it will not execute itself.

Nor, though I should allow that the law is at present impeded by difficulties which cannot be broken through, but by men of more spirit and dignity than the ministers may be inclined to trust with commissions of the peace, yet it can only be collected that another law is necessary, not that the law now proposed will be of any advantage.

Great use has been made of the inefficacy of the present law to decry the proposal made by the noble Lord [a member of the Opposition] for laying a high duty upon these pernicious liquors. High duties have already, as we are informed, been tried without advantage. High duties are at this hour imposed upon those spirits which are retailed, yet we see them every day sold in the streets, without the payment of the tax required, and therefore it will be folly to make a second essay of means, which have been found, by the essay of many years, unsuccessful.

It has been granted on all sides in this debate, nor was it ever denied on any other occasion, that the consumption of any commodity is most easily hindered by raising its price, and its price is to be raised by the imposition of a duty. This, my Lords, which is, I suppose, the opinion of every man, of whatever degree of experience or understanding, appears likewise to have been thought of by the authors of the present law, and therefore they imagined that they had effectually provided against the increase of drunkenness, by laying upon that liquor which should be retailed in small quantities a duty which none of the inferior classes of drunkards would be able to pay.

Thus, my Lords, they conceived that they had reformed the common people without infringing the pleasures of others, and applauded the happy contrivance by which spirits were to be made dear only to the poor, while every man who could afford to purchase two gallons was at liberty to riot at his ease, and, over a full, flowing bumper, look down with contempt upon his former companions, now ruthlessly condemned to disconsolate sobriety.

But, my Lords, this intention was frustrated, and the project, ingenious as it was, fell to the ground; for, though they had laid a tax, they unhappily forgot this tax would make no addition to the price unless it was paid, and that it would not be paid unless some were empowered to collect it.

Here, my Lords, was the difficulty; those who made the law were inclined to lay a tax from which themselves should be exempt, and therefore would not charge the liquor as it issued from the still; and when once it was dispersed in the hands of petty dealers, it was no longer to be found without the assistance of informers, and informers could not carry on the business of prosecution without the consent of the people.

It is not necessary to dwell any longer upon the law, the repeal of which is proposed, since it appears already that it failed only from a partiality not easily defended, and from the omission of what we now propose, the collecting the duty from the still-head.

If this method be followed, there will be no longer any need of informations or of any rigorous or new measures; the same officers that collect a smaller duty may levy a greater; nor can they be easily deceived with regard to the quantities that are made—the deceits, at least, that can be used are in use already; they are frequently detected and suppressed; nor will a larger duty enable the distillers to elude the vigilance of the officers with more success.

Against this proposal, therefore, the inefficacy of the present law can be no objection. But it

is urged that such duties would destroy the trade of distilling, and a noble lord has been pleased to express great tenderness for a manufacture so beneficial and extensive.

That a large duty, levied at the still, would destroy, or very much impair, the trade of distilling, is certainly supposed by those who defend it, for they proposed it only for that end: and what better method can they propose, when they are called to deliberate upon a bill for the prevention of the excessive use of distilled liquors?

The noble lord has been pleased kindly to inform us that the trade of distilling is very extensive; that it employs great numbers; and that they have arrived at an exquisite skill, and therefore—note well the consequence—the trade of distilling is not to be discouraged.

Once more, my Lords, allow me to wonder at the different conceptions of different understandings. It appears to me that since the spirits which the distillers produce are allowed to enfeeble the limbs and vitiate the blood, to pervert the heart and obscure the intellects, that the number of distillers should be no argument in their favour; for I never heard that a law against theft was repealed or delayed because thieves were numerous. It appears to me, my Lords, that if so formidable a body are confederated against the virtue or the lives of their fellow-citizens, it is time to put an end to the havoc, and to interpose, while it is yet in our power, to stop the destruction.

So little, my Lords, am I affected with the merit of the wonderful skill which the distillers are said to have attained, that it is, in my opinion, no faculty of great use to mankind to prepare palatable poison; nor shall I ever contribute my interest for the reprieve of a murderer, because he has, by long practice, obtained great dexterity in his trade.

If their liquors are so delicious that the people are tempted to their own destruction, let us at length, my Lords, secure them from these fatal draughts, by bursting the vials that contain them. Let us crush at once these artists in slaughter, who have reconciled their countrymen to sickness and to ruin, and spread over the pitfalls of debauchery such baits as cannot be resisted.

The noble lord has, indeed, admitted that this bill may not be found sufficiently coercive, but gives us hopes that it may be improved and enforced another year, and persuades us to endeavour a reformation of drunkenness by degrees, and, above all, to beware at present of hurting the *manufacture*.

I am very far, my Lords, from thinking that there are, this year, any peculiar reasons for tolerating murder; nor can I conceive why the manufacture should be held sacred now, if it be to be destroyed hereafter. We are, indeed, desired to try how far this law will operate, that we may be more able to proceed with due regard to this valuable manufacture.

With regard to the operation of the law, it appears to me that it will only enrich the Government without reforming the people; and I believe there are not many of a different opinion. If any diminution of the sale of spirits be expected from it, it is to be considered that this diminution will, or will not, be such as is desired for the reformation of the people. If it be sufficient, the manufacture is at an end, and all the reasons against a higher duty are of equal force against this; but if it is not sufficient, we have, at least, omitted part of our duty, and have neglected the health and virtue of the people.

I cannot, my Lords, yet discover why a reprieve is desired for this manufacture—why the present year is not equally propitious to the reformation of mankind as any will be that may succeed it. It is true we are at war with two nations, and perhaps with more; but war may be better prosecuted without money than without men. And we but little consult the military glory of our country if we raise supplies for paying our armies by the destruction of those armies that we are contriving to pay.

We have heard the necessity of reforming the nation by degrees urged as an argument for imposing first a lighter duty, and afterward a heavier. This complacence for wickedness, my Lords, is not so defensible as that it should be battered by arguments in form, and therefore I shall only relate a reply made by Webb, the noted walker, upon a parallel occasion.

This man, who must be remembered by many of your Lordships, was remarkable for vigour, both of mind and body, and lived wholly upon water for his drink, and chiefly upon vegetables for his other sustenance. He was one day recommending his regimen to one of his friends who loved wine, and who perhaps might somewhat contribute to the prosperity of this spirituous manufacture, and urged him, with great earnestness, to quit a course of luxury by which his health and his intellects would equally be destroyed. The gentleman appeared convinced, and told him "that he would conform to his counsel, and thought he could not change his course of life at once, but would leave off strong liquors by degrees." "By degrees!" says the other, with indignation. "If you should unhappily fall into the fire, would you caution your servants not to pull you out but by degrees?"

This answer, my Lords, is applicable to the present case. The nation is sunk into the lowest state of corruption; the people are not only vicious, but insolent beyond example. They not only break the laws, but defy them; and yet some of your Lordships are for reforming them *by degrees!*

I am not so easily persuaded, my Lords, that

our ministers really intend to supply the defects that may hereafter be discovered in this bill. It will doubtless produce money, perhaps much more than they appear to expect from it. I doubt not but the licensed retailers will be more than fifty thousand, and the quantity retailed must increase with the number of retailers. As the bill will, therefore, answer all the ends intended by it, I do not expect to see it altered; for I have never observed ministers desirous of amending their own errors, unless they are such as have caused a deficiency in the revenue.

Besides, my Lords, it is not certain that when this fund is mortgaged to the public creditors, they can prevail upon the Commons to change the security. They may continue the bill in force for the reasons, whatever they are, for which they have passed it, and the good intentions of our ministers, however sincere, may be defeated, and drunkenness, legal drunkenness, established in the nation.

This, my Lords, is very reasonable, and therefore we ought to exert ourselves for the safety of the nation while the power is yet in our own hands, and, without regard to the opinion or proceedings of the other House, show that we are yet the chief guardians of the people.

The ready compliance of the Commons with the measures proposed in this bill has been mentioned here, with a view, I suppose, of influencing us, but surely by those who had forgotten our independence, or resigned their own. It is not only the right but the duty of either House to deliberate, without regard to the determinations of the other; for how should the nation receive any benefit from the distinct powers that compose the Legislature unless the determinations are without influence upon each other? If either the example or authority of the Commons can divert us from following our own convictions, we are no longer part of the Legislature; we have given up our honours and our privileges, and what then is our concurrence but slavery, or our suffrage but an echo?

The only argument, therefore, that now remains is the expediency of gratifying those by whose ready subscription the exigencies our new statesmen have brought upon us have been supported, and of continuing the security by which they have been encouraged to such liberal contributions.

Public credit, my Lords, is indeed of very great importance, but public credit can never be long supported without public virtue; nor, indeed, if the Government could mortgage the morals and health of the people would it be just and rational to confirm the bargain. If the ministry can raise money only by the destruction of their fellow-subjects, they ought to abandon those schemes for which the money is necessary; for what calamity can be equal to unbounded wickedness?

But, my Lords, there is no necessity for a choice which may cost our ministers so much regret, for the same subscriptions may be procured by an offer of the same advantages to a fund of any other kind, and the sinking fund will easily supply any deficiency that might be suspected in another scheme.

To confess the truth, I should feel very little pain from an account that the nation was for some time determined to be less liberal of their contributions, and that money was withheld till it was known in what expeditions it was to be employed, to what princes subsidies were to be paid, and what advantages were to be purchased by it for our country. I should rejoice, my Lords, to hear that the lottery by which the deficiencies of this duty are to be supplied was not filled, and that the people were grown at last wise enough to discern the fraud and to prefer honest commerce, by which all may be gainers, to a game by which the greatest number must certainly be losers.

The lotteries, my Lords, which former ministers have proposed have always been censured by those who saw their nature and their tendency. They have been considered as legal cheats, by which the ignorant and the rash are defrauded, and the subtle and avaricious often enriched; they have been allowed to divert the people from trade, and to alienate them from useful industry. A man who is uneasy in his circumstances and idle in his disposition, collects the remains of his fortune and buys tickets in a lottery, retires from business, indulges himself in laziness, and waits, in some obscure place, the event of his adventure. Another, instead of employing his stock in trade, rents a garret, and makes it his business, by false intelligence and chimerical alarms, to raise and sink the price of tickets alternately, and takes advantage of the lies which he has himself invented.

Such, my Lords, is the traffic that is produced by this scheme of getting money; nor were these inconveniences unknown to the present ministers in the time of their predecessors, whom they never ceased to pursue with the loudest clamours whenever the exigencies of the Government reduced them to a lottery.

If I, my Lords, might presume to recommend to our ministers the most probable method of raising a large sum for the payment of the troops of the Electorate, I should, instead of the tax and lottery now proposed, advise them to establish a certain number of licensed wheel-barrows, on which the laudable trade of thimble and button might be carried on for the support of the war, and shoe-boys might contribute to the defence of the house of *Austria* by raffling for apples.

Having now, my Lords, examined, with the utmost candour, all the reasons which have been offered in defence of the bill, I cannot conceal the result of my inquiry. The arguments have had so little effect upon my understanding that, as every man judges of others by himself, I can-

not believe that they have any influence even upon those that offer them, and therefore I am convinced that this bill must be the result of considerations which have been hitherto concealed, and is intended to promote designs which are never to be discovered by the authors before their execution.

With regard to these motives and designs, however artfully concealed, every lord in this House is at liberty to offer his conjectures.

When I consider, my Lords, the tendency of this bill, I find it calculated only for the propagation of diseases, the suppression of industry, and the destruction of mankind. I find it the most fatal engine that ever was pointed at a people—an engine by which those who are not killed will be disabled, and those who preserve their limbs will be deprived of their senses.

This bill, therefore, appears to be designed only to thin the ranks of mankind, and to disburden the world of the multitudes that inhabit it; and is perhaps the strongest proof of political sagacity that our new ministers have yet exhibited. They well know, my Lords, that they are universally detested, and that whenever a Briton is destroyed, they are freed from an enemy; they have therefore opened the flood-gates of gin upon the nation, that, when it is less numerous, it may be more easily governed.

Other ministers, my Lords, who had not attained to so great a knowledge in the art of making war upon their country, when they found their enemies clamorous and bold, used to awe them with prosecutions and penalties, or destroy them like burglars, with prisons and with gibbets. But every age, my Lords, produces some improvement; and every nation, however degenerate, gives birth, at some happy period of time, to men of great and enterprising genius. It is our fortune to be witnesses of a new discovery in politics. We may congratulate ourselves upon being contemporaries with those men who have shown that hangmen and halters are unnecessary in a state; and that ministers may escape the reproach of destroying their enemies by inciting them to destroy themselves.

This new method may, indeed, have upon different constitutions a different operation; it may destroy the lives of some and the senses of others; but either of these effects will answer the purposes of the ministry, to whom it is indifferent, provided the nation becomes insensible whether pestilence or lunacy prevails among them. Either mad or dead the greatest part of the people must quickly be, or there is no hope of the continuance of the present ministry.

For this purpose, my Lords, what could have been invented more efficacious than an establishment of a certain number of shops at which poison may be vended—poison so prepared as to please the palate, while it wastes the strength, and only kills by intoxication? From the first instant that any of the enemies of the ministry shall grow clamorous and turbulent, a crafty hireling may lead him to the ministerial slaughter-house, and ply him with their wonder-working liquor till he is no longer able to speak or think; and, my Lords, no man can be more agreeable to our ministers than he that can neither speak nor think, except those who *speak without thinking*.

But, my Lords, the ministers ought to reflect, that though all the people of the present age are their enemies, yet they have made no trial of the temper and inclinations of posterity. Our successors may be of opinions very different from ours. They may *perhaps* approve of wars on the Continent, while our plantations are insulted and our trade obstructed; they may think the support of the house of Austria of more importance to us than our own defence; and may perhaps so far differ from their fathers, as to imagine the treasures of Britain very properly employed in supporting the troops, and increasing the splendour, of a foreign Electorate.

PHILIP DODDRIDGE.

1702-1751.

CAPERNAUM.*

AND now, methinks, I am ready to interrupt my discourse, and could rather, were I sure you would attend me in it, sit down and cover my face and weep. For if these are indeed the words of the Son of God, they are big with a terrible tempest; and it hangs over what we call the Christian world; it hangs over this island, which is in many respects the glory of it. And have we no forebodings where the heaviest part of it might justly fall? Is there no city that rises to our thoughts far superior to Capernaum in its wealth and magnificence, and in some respects more than equal to it in its guilt? O London, London! dear city of my birth and education, seat of so many of my friends, seat of our princes and senators, centre of our commerce, heart of our island, which must feel and languish, must tremble, and, I had almost said, die with thee. How art thou lifted up to heaven. How high do thy glories rise; and how bright do they shine. How great is thy magnificence. How extensive thy commerce.

* Matt. xi. 23.

How numerous, how free, how happy thy inhabitants. How happy, above all, in their religious opportunities. In the uncorrupted Gospel, so long, so faithfully preached in thy synagogues, displayed in so many peculiar glories, which were but beginning to dawn when Jesus himself dwelt in Capernaum, and preached repentance there. But while we survey these heights of elevation, must we not tremble, lest thou shouldst fall so much the lower, lest thou shouldst plunge so much the deeper in ruin?

My situation, sirs, is not such as to render me most capable of judging concerning the moral character of this our justly-celebrated metropolis. But who can hear what seems the most credible reports of it—yea, I will add, who can walk its streets but for a few days with observation and not take an alarm, and be ready to meditate terror? Whose spirit must not, like that of Paul at Athens, be stirred, when he sees the city so abandoned to profaneness, luxury, and vanity? Is it indeed false all that we hear? Is it indeed accidental all that we see? Is London wronged, when it is said, that great licentiousness reigns amongst most of its inhabitants, and great indolence and indifference to religion, even among those who are not licentious? That assemblies for divine worship are much neglected, or frequented with little appearance of seriousness or solemnity; while assemblies for pleasure are thronged, and attended with such an eagerness, that all the heart and soul seems to be given to them, rather than to God? That most of its families are prayerless, wanting time, it seems, or rather wanting heart, for those social devotions; while many hours of every day can be given to recreations or amusements at home, if by any accident it is impracticable to seek them abroad? That the Sabbath, instead of being religiously observed, is given to jaunts of pleasure into neighbouring villages, or wasted on beds of sloth, or at tables of excess? That not only persons in the highest ranks of life, but that the trading part of its citizens, affect such an excessive gaiety, and grandeur, and delicacy, the very reverse of that frugality of our ancestors, who raised the city to what it is? That men in almost every rank are ambitious of appearing to be something more than those who stand in the next rank above them could conveniently allow themselves to appear; and in consequence of this are grasping at business they cannot manage, entering into engagements for what they cannot answer; and so, after a vain and contemptible blaze, drawing bankruptcy upon themselves and exposing to the danger of it honest, industrious persons, who are won by that suspicious face of plenty to repose a confidence in them, on that very account so much the less reasonable and safe? That the poorer sort of people are so grossly ignorant as to know hardly anything of religion, but the sacred names which they continually profane; so wretchedly depraved, as to consume their time and strength in reaching at those low and pernicious luxuries which they may hope to attain; and so abandoned as to sink unchastised into the most brutal sensualities and impurities; while those who could exert any remarkable zeal to remedy these evils, by introducing a deep and warm sense of religion into the minds of others, are suspected and censured as whimsical and enthusiastical, if not designing men? In a word, that the religion of our Divine Master is, by multitudes, of the great and the vulgar, openly renounced and blasphemed; and by others but coldly defended, as if it were grown a matter of mere indifference, which men might, without any degree of mischief, reject at their pleasure—yea, as if it were a matter of great doubt and uncertainty, whether men's souls were immortal, or whether they were extinguished with so empty and insignificant a life? Men and brethren, are these things indeed to be so? I take not upon me to answer absolutely that they are; but I will venture to say, that if they are indeed thus, London, as rich and grand, and glorious as it is, has reason to tremble, and to tremble so much the more for its abused riches, grandeur, and glory.

ON SEEING HIM THAT IS INVISIBLE.

Endeavour to get a firm and rational persuasion of the existence, providence, and presence of God. You all allow the thing at first hearing; but have you a firm persuasion of it in your own minds? do you consider how evident, how apparent, how certain it is? look about you, look within you, and reflect seriously. Could these things be without a God? Could I be without Him? Did I call myself into being? Did another creature create me? if he were the means of producing me, how came he by that power? how was he himself produced by another, and another? Still you will come to him who was the son of him, who was the son of God. How were the sun and moon formed, and the host of heaven? who gave to them all their lustre? who fixed them in their orbs? who moves them with that swiftness and steadiness, so that all the process and order of them is the same from generation to generation? look upon the tokens of His goodness, as well as of His power, in the formation of your body and your mind. Thou hast possessed my reins. Thou enterest, as it were, into the most vital parts of my frame, and there Thou dwellest and actest continually; and there Thou, Lord, art doing I know not particularly and assuredly what. But that which, because I know not, it is plain that I do not myself; and yet that which, if it be not done, I must die in a moment, and this poor body sink and drop under its own weight. Look about into the world: wherever you direct your eyes, you may trace the footsteps of Deity, and you must say, I am sure that God has been

here, by the blessings which He has scattered and left behind Him; or rather, I am sure that He is here, by the blessings which at every moment He is dealing out. How does the grass grow, the fruit ripen, the animals live? it is because God gives grass for the cattle, and corn and herb for the service of man; it is because God feeds the fowls of the air, and they fly by His power.

I will not, then, set it down among possibilities, among probabilities, that there may probably or possibly be a God, but among the greatest certainties, of which the mind of man is capable; as a thing of which I have as much evidence, as that there is any visible being at all, as great as that I have myself the power of thought.

Endeavour to view the blessed God in the light in which the Gospel of His Son has placed him. It is so noble and so amiable to view, that if you accustom yourselves to it, you will delight to dwell upon it, and to review it again and again. It represents God, not as slighting this world of ours, even when it had offended Him, not as immediately destroying it, or as marking its inhabitants for a day of slaughter, as traitors, and maintained at the expense of the king till their execution day is come; but as entertaining thoughts of love and mercy toward poor, sinful man, as caring for us with a great care, and employing His counsels, even long before we were born, for our deliverance, and for our salvation. It represents Him as busying Himself so much (if I may use the expression) about us and our concerns, as to send His own Son to inform us who He himself is, and what He would have us to be, what He expects from us on the one hand, and what we may expect from Him on the other. Yea, as sending His Son in a mortal body that He might converse with us for a long time, and might sow the seeds of true religion in our world, seeds which were to last as long as this world itself, and that He might at length die for us too, and redeem us to God, by pouring forth His own blood, and that He might leave a Gospel behind Him, written by the inspiration of His Spirit, which, under Divine blessing and grace, might be the food and comfort of souls from one generation to another: that Gospel which He brought down from heaven. Oh! did those poor blind heathens reverence and adore a senseless image of deity because they supposed it of heavenly original, the image that fell down from Jupiter out of heaven! What reason have we to value Christ and His Gospel as of celestial original indeed; and to love that God who sent us such a present, a blessing so much more valuable than the sun in the firmament. And how delightful should it be to us to look to the blessed God in this, as "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," and, in and through Him, as "the Father of mercies, and the God of all consolation."

Labour to secure an interest in God through Christ, and then it will be pleasant to maintain a sight of Him. The great reason why men look at God no more is because they dread the sight of Him, their consciences telling them that He is their enemy, or at least that He may be so; that it is at best a very dubious case whether they have any interest in Him or not. Labour, therefore, I beseech you, to make it out to your own souls, as a plain and evident thing, that you have a covenant interest in God. And how can this be done but by solemnly laying hold of His covenant in Christ, and by setting your seal to it? Wilt thou not, says God, from this time cry unto me, My Father, Thou art the guide of my youth? And surely it is a pleasant thing for a dutiful and affectionate child to look upon his Father. View Him not merely as reconcilable, as one who may, perhaps, lay aside His wrath and become your friend, but as one who is actually reconciled. Go to Him, therefore, this day and say, "Lord, I have been a rebel, and I have deserved to die for my rebellion. I deserve that He who made me should not have mercy on me, and that He who formed me should show me no favour. But I have heard that Thou art a merciful God. I have been told that Thou didst condescend to say, and even to swear, that 'Thou desirest not the death of a sinner.' I have been told that Thou didst send Thine own dear and gracious Son into this world of ours to call back poor lost creatures to Thee, and to purchase pardon for them, and to declare it to them; yea, that Thou hast assured us by Him that he 'who believes shall have eternal life.' 'Now, Lord, I believe, help Thou my unbelief.' I have been told that Thou hast been pleased to make a covenant, a new and better covenant, with poor sinners, of which He is the surety. I desire to enter myself into this covenant; I am heartily willing to be saved by Thee in Thine own way, and therefore I beseech Thee that Thou wouldst save me. I beseech Thee that Thou wouldst become my God and Father in Christ, and I present myself to Thee in token of this desire, and would gladly, whenever Thou shalt give me an opportunity, do it at Thy table. Yea, I desire daily to repeat it as my own act and deed, to give myself to Thee, and to receive Thee, through Christ, into my soul as my portion, and hope, and God." When you are conscious of this temper you will view God not only with pleasure, but I had almost said, in allusion to the common form of our expressing ourselves, with pride (but that were improper), with humble joy and triumph, as the Psalmist, "Behold this God is our God!" O how I delight to fix my eyes upon Him, and survey Him in this view! This God, with all His infinite wisdom and almighty power, and immense inexhaustible treasure of goodness, and mercy, and faithfulness, and love, is mine, and mine for ever. Shall one man view his estate, and another his

honour with satisfaction? and another perhaps his person, and another even his dress, and inwardly congratulate himself that he is so rich, and so powerful, and so beautiful, and so fine? And shall not I, with infinitely greater satisfaction, view my God, and congratulate my own soul that I am so happy as to possess Him, and to stand in such a relation to Him? I would do it every day and every hour.

If you desire to maintain such views of Him, who is invisible, then guard against an undue attachment to all things that are seen, to this world and its interests.

These things, do, as it were, stand in the way of God; they make such a crowd about us that we cannot see Him. It alienates the heart from His love and service; so says the apostle in those remarkable words, "Love not the world nor the things of the world; for if any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him" (1 John ii. 15). If you are much attached to worldly interests, you will venture to displease God for the sake of them, and then, when you have displeased Him, you will not care to see Him with those marks of displeasure which His awful countenance will wear. As our Lord says, "No man can serve two masters; you cannot serve God and Mammon;" and the soul that serves not God with some degree of zeal, as well as of fidelity, loves not to see Him, and thus the world concludes. Whereas the heart in which God has dwelt, and which has been used to live in the sight of Him, when flesh and heart fail, has something for "the strength of its heart and its portion for ever." What then will you say, must we needs go out of the world, and betake ourselves to the life of hermits, that we may preserve religion in our hearts? By no means. We may do it with much greater honour to religion by abiding in the converse of the world, even though we had it in our power to quit it, which many of us have not. We may show more of the force of it, and we may spread more of the spirit of it, by a social and conversable life. But then let us take heed that business and conversation do not possess our minds so much as to leave in them no room for God. Let us take care that we be often looking at the blessed God while we are conversing in the world; and let us guard against a fond affection for anything in this world which would give us a disrelish of devotion and the exercises of it. The greatest and noblest exercise is not to fly from the world, but to meet and conquer it; nor can it be better expressed than by the apostle, that "those who rejoice should be as though they rejoiced not."

If we would maintain habitual intercourse with God, let us think frequently and solemnly of the invisible world to which we are going. This advice stands in connection with the former, both giving and receiving strength, and therefore they are joined by the apostle, "Look not at the things which are seen, but at those things which are unseen." How happy would it be for us in this respect if we could look at the things which are unseen! Is there not a world of spirits of a nature quite different from and vastly superior to this world of bodies in which we dwell? Expatiate, my thoughts, in this immense region. And what inhabitants dost thou see here? I see on the one hand the paradise of God, where Jehovah dwells; on the other, millions of bright and happy creatures who, during the many thousand years for which they have existed (and God only knows how many thousand), have never known a sentiment of guilt or a perception of misery. Is there not such a species of beings? I certainly know from the Word of God that there is, and that among them there are human spirits, who once dwelt in such bodies as mine, and having broken their way through the entanglements, temptations, and dangers of life, are received by the angels as their brethren and friends, and dwell with them, sharing, in some considerable degree, in their business and their pleasures. And is there not another kind of a region, of darkness and despair, where the fallen spirits dwell? "The angels that kept not their first state," but sinned, and upon that were cast down from heaven! And are there not, likewise, among them vast numbers that once dwelt upon earth, who saw the sun, and tasted but abused the bounty of their Creator? Thousands, ten thousands, no doubt, who heard His word, but trifled with the grace of His Gospel during the certain time which God had allotted to them for their trial, and who are cut off, and are under condemnation, to whom "nothing remains but a certain fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation." And are these scenes which have no connection with my *concerns*? I see one and another of my fellow-creatures drop the body and disappear. The invisible spirit flies off, and the poor abandoned carcase is laid in the dust, that it may not affect the living, and thus it becomes invisible too as to any certain remainder which can be traced of it; and must not I shortly take my turn? I am even now surrounded by these invisible beings; the angels wait to guard me, and are the instruments of a gracious providence for my preservation; the devils are near too, and wait opportunities of mischief, and ere long I shall see myself in the hands of the one or of the other, and know that they are bearing me on my way to heaven or to hell as my final, as my everlasting abode. When this thought enters deep into the mind it will be natural to look to an invisible God, the great Lord of both these worlds, and of all their various inhabitants: it is natural to commit a soul, an immortal soul (the importance of which will then be felt), to His powerful and faithful care.

That we should often be setting ourselves to think expressly of God, and to speak directly to Him.

Visible objects have a great advantage over us. We must, therefore, have our proper seasons of retirement, our proper times for calling our thoughts from the world, for charging them to have done with it, that we may converse with God and Divine things; that we should summon up our souls to the work, as David, "Bless the Lord, O my soul," etc. (Psalm ciii. 1, 2); so should we say, "View the Lord, O my soul, contemplate Him and His glories. O think what a mysterious, what a marvellous, what an amiable being He is! Look through the whole creation, and see what deserves thy esteem, thy love, and thy trust, in comparison with Him: He is accessible through Christ, He hears prayers, He listens to the cry of His servants and His people. Resolve, therefore, that thou wilt converse with Him: address Him, therefore, by daily prayer, and particularly in secret. Enter into thy closet, it will assist thy conceptions of Him, it will remind thee of His existence, and of thy business with Him there; and see to it that this part of duty do not degenerate into a form, that the soul be right with God while it is performed: and I do not doubt but it will have a most happy influence; and will bring the mind to such a temper and disposition that you may often be able to direct the eye of the soul to God in the intervals of such solemnities; as a pious native of France expresses it, that when he passed through the streets of Paris, where one may well imagine there would be diversions enough, his soul was no more moved than if he were in a desert.

Let us cry earnestly to the great Father of spirits to direct our fallen and degenerate minds to Himself, if we desire to maintain our frequent views of Him.

We might, says that excellent person to whom I have just referred, as soon bring down fire from heaven, or draw the stars from their orbits, as kindle devotion in our own cold dead hearts without a Divine agency and operation. The Lord opened the eyes of Hagar, and she saw the relief which He had prepared for her in the wilderness. He must open our eyes, or we shall not see Him. Cry, therefore, to Him with all your souls, and if you feel your hearts raised to Him, look upon it as a token for good, as an assurance not only of His providential but gracious presence. "O thou King eternal, immortal, and invisible! Thou art ever with me, and yet I see Thee not: ever near to me, and yet I do not perceive Thee: and important as Thy presence is, I am often insensible of it: and shall it be always thus? Lord! I cannot bear it. I am persuaded that I see; and, blessed be Thy name, I feel it, that it were better to die than to live as at a distance from Thee: better to have no being at all than to lose God among His creatures, though it were the most excellent of them: and, therefore, O Lord, I earnestly entreat this favour of Thee, not that Thou wouldst make me rich and great, that Thou wouldst prosper me in my worldly affairs, though I desire such prosperity as Thou shalt see best, but that the eye of my soul may be directed to Thee. I would say as Thy servant Moses, 'O Lord! I beseech Thee, show me Thy glory' (Exod. xxxiii. 18), in a spiritual sense! Give me such a view of Thee as may fix my roving mind upon Thee more than ever! Let me see Thee so as to rejoice, if it be Thy blessed will; but if not, let me see Thee, so as to fear Thee, and to love Thee, and to conduct myself in a manner that may be agreeable to Thee: that in whatever darkness I now walk, I may at last come to see light in Thy light, so to behold Thy face in righteousness, as to be satisfied with Thy complete likeness; and, when my foolish heart would lose sight of Thee in the midst of these surrounding vanities, let me rather be made to feel Thine hand smiting me than to live in a forgetfulness of Thy presence."

Is there a heart in this assembly that can say amen to these petitions? If there be, I will be humbly bold to say it is a heart that has already seen God, a heart that, persisting in these sentiments, will see and enjoy Him for ever.

JOHN WESLEY.

1703-1791.

FREE GRACE.*

How freely does God love the world! While we were yet sinners, "Christ died for the ungodly." While we were "dead in sin," God "spared not his own Son, but delivered Him up for us all." And how freely with Him does He "give us all things!" Verily, Free Grace is all in all.

The grace or love of God, whence cometh our salvation, is free in all, and free for all.

First, It is free in all to whom it is given. It does not depend on any power or merit in man; no, not in any degree, neither in whole, nor in part. It does not in anywise depend either on

* "He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things" (Rom. viii. 32)?
Preached at Bristol, in the year 1740.

the good works or righteousness of the receiver; not on anything he has done, or anything he is. It does not depend on his endeavours. It does not depend on his good tempers, or good desires, or good purposes and intentions; for all these flow from the free grace of God; they are the streams only, not the fountain. They are the fruits of free grace, and not the root. They are not the cause, but the effects of it. Whatsoever good is in man, or is done by man, God is the author and doer of it. Thus is His grace free in all; that is, no way depending on any power or merit in man, but on God alone, who freely gave us His own Son, and "with Him freely giveth us all things."

But is it free for all, as well as in all? To this some have answered, "No; it is free only for those whom God hath ordained to life; and they are but a little flock. The greater part of mankind God hath ordained to death; and it is not free for them. Them God hateth; and, therefore, before they were born, decreed they should die eternally. And this He absolutely decreed, because so was His good pleasure—because it was His sovereign will. Accordingly, they are born for this,—to be destroyed body and soul in hell. And they grow up under the irrevocable curse of God, without any possibility of redemption; for what grace God gives, He gives only for this, to increase, not prevent, their damnation."

This is that decree of predestination. But methinks I hear one say, "This is not the predestination which I hold: I hold only the election of grace. What I believe is no more than this,—that God, before the foundation of the world, did elect a certain number of men to be justified, sanctified, and glorified. Now, all these will be saved, and none else; for the rest of mankind God leaves to themselves. So they follow the imaginations of their own hearts, which are only evil continually, and, waxing worse and worse, are at length justly punished with everlasting destruction."

Is this all the predestination which you hold? Consider; perhaps this is not all. Do not you believe God ordained them to this very thing? If so, you believe the whole decree; you hold predestination in the full sense which has been above described. But it may be you think you do not. Do not you then believe God hardens the hearts of them that perish? Do not you believe He (literally) hardened Pharaoh's heart; and that for this end He raised him up, or created him? Why, this amounts to just the same thing. If you believe Pharaoh, or any one man upon earth, was created for this end—to be damned—you hold all that has been said of predestination. And there is no need you should add that God seconds His decree, which is supposed unchangeable and irresistible, by hardening the hearts of those vessels of wrath whom that decree had before fitted for destruction.

Well, but it may be you do not believe even this; you do not hold any decree of reprobation; you do not think God decrees any man to be damned, nor hardens, irresistibly fits him, for damnation; you only say, "God eternally decreed that all being dead in sin He would say to some of the dry bones, Live, and to others He would not; that, consequently, these should be made alive, and those abide in death—these should glorify God by their salvation, and those by their destruction."

Is not this what you mean by the election of grace? If it be, I would ask one or two questions: Are any who are not thus elected saved? or were any, from the foundation of the world? Is it possible any man should be saved unless he be thus elected? If you say, "No," you are but where you was; you are not got one hair's breadth further; you still believe that, in consequence of an unchangeable, irresistible decree of God, the greater part of mankind abide in death, without any possibility of redemption; inasmuch as none can save them but God, and He will not save them. You believe He hath absolutely decreed not to save them; and what is this but decreeing to damn them? It is, in effect, neither more nor less; it comes to the same thing; for if you are dead, and altogether unable to make yourself alive, then, if God has absolutely decreed He will make only others alive, and not you, He hath absolutely decreed your everlasting death; you are absolutely consigned to damnation. So then, though you use softer words than some, you mean the self-same thing; and God's decree concerning the election of grace according to your account of it, amounts to neither more nor less than what others call God's decree of reprobation.

Call it, therefore, by whatever name you please, election, preterition, predestination, or reprobation, it comes in the end to the same thing. The sense of all is plainly this,—by virtue of an eternal, unchangeable, irresistible decree of God, one part of mankind are infallibly saved, and the rest infallibly damned; it being impossible that any of the former should be damned, or that any of the latter should be saved.

But if this be so, then is all preaching vain. It is needless to them that are elected; for they, whether with preaching or without, will infallibly be saved. Therefore, the end of preaching—to save souls—is void with regard to them; and it is useless to them that are not elected, for they cannot possibly be saved. They, whether with preaching or without, will infallibly be damned. The end of preaching is, therefore, void with regard to them likewise; so that in either case our preaching is vain, as your hearing is also vain.

This, then, is a plain proof that the doctrine of predestination is not a doctrine of God, because it makes void the ordinance of God; and

God is not divided against Himself. A second is that it directly tends to destroy that holiness which is the end of all the ordinances of God. I do not say none who hold it are holy (for God is of tender mercy to those who are unavoidably entangled in errors of any kind); but that the doctrine itself—that every man is either elected or not elected from eternity, and that the one must inevitably be saved, and the other inevitably damned—has a manifest tendency to destroy holiness in general; for it wholly takes away those first motives to follow after it, so frequently proposed in Scripture, the hope of future reward and fear of punishment, the hope of heaven and fear of hell. That these shall go away into everlasting punishment, and those into life eternal, is no motive to him to struggle for life who believes his lot is cast already; it is not reasonable for him so to do, if he thinks he is unalterably adjudged either to life or death. You will say, "But he knows not whether it is life or death." What then?—this helps not the matter; for if a sick man knows that he must unavoidably die, or unavoidably recover, though he knows not which, it is unreasonable for him to take any physic at all. He might justly say (and so I have heard some speak, both in bodily sickness and in spiritual), "If I am ordained to life, I shall live; if to death, I shall die; so I need not trouble myself about it." So directly does this doctrine tend to shut the very gate of holiness in general—to hinder unholy men from ever approaching thereto, or striving to enter in thereat.

As directly does this doctrine tend to destroy several particular branches of holiness. Such are meekness and love—love, I mean, of our enemies—of the evil and unthankful. I say not, that none who hold it have meekness and love (for as is the power of God, so is His mercy); but that it naturally tends to inspire or increase a sharpness or eagerness of temper, which is quite contrary to the meekness of Christ; as then specially appears, when they are opposed on this head. And it as naturally inspires contempt or coldness towards those whom we suppose outcasts from God. "O but," you say, "I suppose no particular man a reprobate." You mean you would not if you could help it; but you cannot help sometimes applying your general doctrine to particular persons; the enemy of souls will apply it for you. You know how often he has done so. But you rejected the thought with abhorrence. True; as soon as you could; but how did it sour and sharpen your spirit in the meantime? You well know it was not the spirit of love which you then felt towards that poor sinner, whom you supposed or suspected, whether you would or no, to have been hated of God from eternity.

Thirdly, this doctrine tends to destroy the comfort of religion, the happiness of Christianity This is evident as to all those who believe themselves to be reprobated, or who only suspect or fear it. All the great and precious promises are lost to them; they afford them no ray of comfort, for they are not the elect of God; therefore they have neither lot nor portion in them. This is an effectual bar to their finding any comfort or happiness, even in that religion whose ways are designed to be "ways of pleasantness, and all her paths peace."

And as to you who believe yourselves the elect of God, what is your happiness? I hope, not a notion, a speculative belief, a bare opinion of any kind, but a feeling possession of God in your heart, wrought in you by the Holy Ghost, or the witness of God's Spirit with your spirit that you are a child of God. This, otherwise termed "the full assurance of faith," is the true ground of a Christian's happiness. And it does indeed imply a full assurance that all your past sins are forgiven, and that you are *now* a child of God. But it does not necessarily imply a full assurance of our future perseverance. I do not say this is never joined to it, but that it is not necessarily implied therein; for many have the one who have not the other.

Now, this witness of the Spirit experience shows to be much obstructed by this doctrine; and not only in those who, believing themselves reprobated, by this belief thrust it far from them, but even in them that have tasted of that good gift, who yet have soon lost it again, and fallen back into doubts, and fears, and darkness—horrible darkness that might be felt. And I appeal to any of you who hold this doctrine, to say, between God and your own hearts, whether you have not often a return of doubts and fears concerning your election or perseverance. If you ask, "Who has not?" I answer, very few of those that hold this doctrine; but many, very many of those that hold it not, in all parts of the earth—many of those who know and feel that they are in Christ to-day, and "take no thought for the morrow;" who "abide in Him" by faith from hour to hour, or, rather, from moment to moment; many of these have enjoyed the uninterrupted witness of His Spirit, the continual light of His countenance, from the moment wherein they first believed, for many months or years, to this day.

That assurance of faith which these enjoy excludes all doubt and fear. It excludes all kinds of doubt and fear concerning their future perseverance; though it is not properly, as was said before, an assurance of what is future, but only of what *now* is. And this needs not for its support a speculative belief, that whoever is once ordained to life must live; for it is wrought, from hour to hour, by the mighty power of God, "by the Holy Ghost which is given unto them." And therefore that doctrine is not of God, because it tends to obstruct, if not destroy, this great work of the Holy Ghost, whence flows

the chief comfort of religion, the happiness of Christianity.

Again, how uncomfortable a thought is this, that thousands and millions of men, without any preceding offence or fault of theirs, were unchangeably doomed to everlasting burnings. How peculiarly uncomfortable must it be to those who have put on Christ, to those who, being filled with bowels of mercy, tenderness, and compassion, could even "wish themselves accursed for their brethren's sake."

Fourthly, this uncomfortable doctrine directly tends to destroy our zeal for good works. And this it does, first, as it naturally tends (according to what was observed before) to destroy our love to the greater part of mankind, namely, the evil and unthankful. For whatever lessens our love, must so far lessen our desire to do them good. This it does, secondly, as it cuts off one of the strongest motives to all acts of bodily mercy, such as feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and the like—viz., the hope of saving their souls from death. For what avails it to relieve their temporal wants, who are just dropping into eternal fire? "Well, but run and snatch them as brands out of the fire." Nay, this you suppose impossible. They were appointed thereunto, you say, from eternity, before they had done either good or evil. You believe it is the will of God they should die. And "who hath resisted His will?" But you say you do not know whether these are elected or not. What then? If you know they are the one or the other—that they are either elected, or not elected—all your labour is void and vain. In either case, your advice, reproof, or exhortation is as neeedless and useless as our preaching. It is needless to them that are elected, for they will infallibly be saved without it. It is useless to them that are not elected, for with or without it they will infallibly be damned; therefore you cannot, consistently with your principles, take any pains about their salvation. Consequently, those principles directly tend to destroy your zeal for good works; for all good works; but particularly for the greatest of all, the saving of souls from death.

But, fifthly, this doctrine not only tends to destroy Christian holiness, happiness, and good works, but hath also a direct and manifest tendency to overthrow the whole Christian revelation. The point which the wisest of the modern unbelievers must industriously labour to prove, is, that the Christian revelation is not necessary. They well know, could they once show this, the conclusion would be too plain to be denied, "if it be not necessary, it is not true." Now, this fundamental point you give up. For supposing that eternal, unchangeable decree, one part of mankind must be saved, though the Christian revelation were not in being, and the other part of mankind must be damned, notwithstanding that revelation. And what would an infidel desire more? You allow him all he asks. In making the Gospel thus unnecessary to all sorts of men; you give up the whole Christian cause. "O tell it not in Gath. Publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised rejoice;" lest the sons of unbelief triumph.

And as this doctrine manifestly and directly tends to overthrow the whole Christian revelation, so it does the same thing, by plain consequence, in making that revelation contradict itself. For it is grounded on such an interpretation of some texts (more or fewer it matters not) as flatly contradicts all the other texts, and indeed the whole scope and tenor of Scripture. For instance, the assertors of this doctrine interpret that text of Scripture, "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated," as implying that God in a literal sense hated Esau, and all the reprobated, from eternity. Now, what can possibly be a more flat contradiction than this, not only to the whole scope and tenor of Scripture, but also to all those particular texts which expressly declare, "God is love?" Again, they infer from that text, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy" (Rom. ix. 15), that God is love only to some men, viz., the elect, and that He hath mercy for those only; flatly contrary to which is the whole tenor of Scripture, as is that express declaration in particular, "The Lord is loving unto every man; and His mercy is over all His works" (Psalm cxlv. 9). Again, they infer from that and the like texts, "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy," that He showeth mercy only to those to whom He had respect from all eternity. Nay, but who replieth against God now? You now contradict the whole oracles of God, which declare throughout, "God is no respector of persons" (Acts x. 34): "There is no respect of persons with Him" (Rom. ii. 11). Again, from that text, "The children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth; it was said unto her," unto Rebecca, "The elder shall serve the younger;" you infer, that our being predestinated, or elect, no way depends on the foreknowledge of God. Flatly contrary to this are all the Scriptures, and those in particular, "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God" (1 Peter i. 2); "Whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate" (Rom. viii. 29).

And "the same Lord over all is rich" in mercy "to all that call upon Him" (Rom. x. 12). But you say, "No, He is such only to those for whom Christ died. And those are not all, but only a few, whom God hath chosen out of the world; for He died not for all, but only for those who were 'chosen in Him before the foundation of the world'" (Eph. i. 4). Flatly contrary to your interpretation of these Scriptures, also, is

the whole tenor of the New Testament; as are in particular those texts: "Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died" (Rom. xiv. 15)—a clear proof that Christ died, not only for those that are saved, but also for them that perish; He is "the Saviour of the world" (John iv. 42); He is "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world" (i. 29); "He is the propitiation, not for our sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world" (1 John ii. 2). "He," the living God, "is the Saviour of all men" (1 Tim. iv. 10); "He gave Himself a ransom for all" (ii. 6); "He tasted death for every man" (Heb. ii. 9).

If you ask, "Why then are not all men saved?" the whole law and the testimony answer, First, Not because of any decree of God; not because it is His pleasure they should die; for, "As I live, saith the Lord God," "I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth" (Ezek. xviii. 3, 32). Whatever be the cause of their perishing, it cannot be His will, if the oracles of God are true; for they declare, "He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance" (2 Pet. iii. 9); "He willeth that all men should be saved." And they, secondly, declare what is the cause why all men are not saved, namely, that they will not be saved. So our Lord expressly, "Ye will not come unto me that ye may have life" (John v. 40). "The power of the Lord is present to heal" them, but they will not be healed. "They reject the counsel," the merciful counsel of God, "against themselves," as did their stiff-necked forefathers. And therefore are they without excuse; because God would save them, but they will not be saved. This is the condemnation, "How often would I have gathered you together, and ye would not" (Matt. xxiii. 37).

Thus manifestly does this doctrine tend to overthrow the whole Christian revelation, by making it contradict itself; by giving such an interpretation of some texts, as flatly contradicts all the other texts, and indeed the whole scope and tenor of Scripture—an abundant proof that it is not of God. But neither is this all, for, seventhly, it is a doctrine full of blasphemy, of such blasphemy as I should dread to mention, but that the honour of our gracious God, and the cause of His truth, will not suffer me to be silent. In the cause of God, then, and from a sincere concern for the glory of His great name, I will mention a few of the horrible blasphemies contained in this horrible doctrine. But first, I must warn every one of you that hears, as ye will answer it at the great day, not to charge me (as some have done) with blaspheming, because I mention the blasphemy of others. And the more you are grieved with them that do thus blaspheme, see that ye "confirm your love towards them" the more, and that your heart's desire, and continual prayer to God, be, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!"

This premised, let it be observed that this doctrine represents our blessed Lord "Jesus Christ the righteous, the only begotten Son of the Father, full of grace and truth," as a hypocrite, a deceiver of the people, a man void of common sincerity. For it cannot be denied that He everywhere speaks as if He were willing that all men should be saved; therefore, to say that He was not willing that all men should be saved, is to represent Him as a mere hypocrite and dissembler. It cannot be denied that the gracious words which come out of His mouth are full of invitations to all sinners: to say, then, that He did not intend to save all sinners is to represent Him as a gross deceiver of the people. You cannot deny that He says, "Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden!" If, then, you say He calls those that cannot come, those whom He can make able to come, but will not, how is it possible to describe greater insincerity? You represent Him as mocking His helpless creatures, by offering what He never intends to give. You describe Him as saying one thing and meaning another; as pretending the love which He had not. Him, in whose mouth was no guile, you make full of deceit, void of common sincerity; then especially, when drawing nigh the city, He wept over it, and said, "O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! thou that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, and ye would not!" Now, if you say they would, but He would not, you represent Him (which who could bear?) as weeping crocodile tears over the prey which He had doomed to destruction!

Such blasphemy this, as one would think, might make the ears of a Christian tingle! But there is yet more behind; for just as it honours the Son, so doth this doctrine honour the Father. It destroys all His attributes at once; it overturns both His justice, mercy, and truth. Yes, it represents the most holy God as worse than the devil; as more false, more cruel, and more unjust! More false, because the devil, liar as he is, hath never said he willeth all mankind to be saved; more unjust, because the devil cannot, if he would, be guilty of such injustice as you ascribe to God, when you say that God condemned millions of souls to everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels, for continuing in sin, which, for want of that grace He will not give them, they cannot avoid; and more cruel, because that unhappy spirit seeketh rest and findeth none. So that his own restless misery is a kind of temptation to him to tempt others; but God resteth in His high and holy place, so that to suppose Him, out of His mere motion, of His pure will and pleasure, happy as He is, to doom His creatures, whether they will or not, to endless misery, is to impute such cruelty to Him as we cannot impute to the great enemy of God and men. It is to represent the most high

God (he that hath ears to hear, let him hear!) as more cruel, false, and unjust than the devil.

This is the blasphemy clearly contained in the horrible doctrine of predestination. And here I fix my foot. On this I join issue with every asserter of it. You represent God as worse than the devil; more false, more cruel, more unjust. But you say you will prove it by Scripture. Hold! What will you prove by Scripture? that God is worse than the devil? It cannot be. Whatever that Scripture proves, it never proves this; whatever be its true meaning, it cannot mean this. Do you ask what is its true meaning, then? If I say I know not, you have gained nothing; for there are many Scriptures, the true sense whereof neither you nor I shall know till death is swallowed up in victory. But this I know, better it were to say it had no sense at all than it had such a sense as this. It cannot mean, whatever it mean beside, that the God of truth is a liar. Let it mean what it will, it cannot mean that the Judge of all the world is unjust. No Scripture can mean that God is not love, or that His mercy is not over all His works; that is, whatever it prove beside, no Scripture can prove predestination.

This is the blasphemy for which I abhor the doctrine of predestination; a doctrine, upon the supposition of which, if one could possibly suppose it for a moment—call it election, reprobation, or what you please (for all comes to the same thing)—one might say to our adversary the devil, "Thou fool, why dost thou prowl about any longer? Thy lying in wait for souls is as needless and as useless as our preaching. Hearest thou not that God hath taken thy work out of thy hands, and that He doth it more effectually? Thou, with all thy principalities and powers, canst only so assault that we may resist thee; but He can irresistibly destroy both body and soul in hell! Thou canst only entice; but His unchangeable decree, to leave thousands of souls in death, compels them to continue in sin till they drop into everlasting burnings. Thou temptest, He forces us to be damned, for we cannot resist His will. Thou fool! why goest thou about any longer, seeking whom thou mayst devour? Hearest thou not that God is the devouring lion, the destroyer of souls, the murderer of men? Moloch caused only children to pass through the fire, and that fire was soon quenched; or the corruptible body being consumed, its torments were at an end; but God, thou art told, by His eternal decree, fixed before they had done good or evil, causes not only children of a span long, but the parents also, to pass through the fire of hell; that fire which never shall be quenched; and the body which is cast thereinto, being now incorruptible and immortal, will be ever consuming and never consumed; but the smoke of their torment, because it is God's good pleasure, ascendeth up for ever."

Oh, how would the enemy of God and men rejoice to hear these things were so! How would he cry aloud and spare not. How would he lift up his voice and say, To your tents, O Israel! Flee from the face of this God or ye shall utterly perish. But whither will ye flee? Into heaven? He is there. Down to hell? He is there also. Ye cannot flee from an omnipresent almighty tyrant. And whether ye flee or stay I call heaven, His throne, and earth, His footstool, to witness against you; ye shall perish, shall perish eternally! Sing, O hell, and rejoice ye that are under the earth! for God, even the mighty God, hath spoken and devoted to death thousands of souls, from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof. Here, O death, is thy sting! Here, O grave, is thy victory! Nations yet unborn, or ever they have done good or evil, are doomed never to see the light of life, but thou shalt gnaw upon them for ever and ever. Let all those morning stars sing together, who fell with Lucifer, son of the morning. Let all the sons of hell shout for joy, for the decree is past, and who shall annul it?

Yes, the decree is past; and so it was before the foundation of the world. But what decree? Even this: "I will set before the sons of men life and death, blessing and cursing;" and "the soul that chooseth life shall live, as the soul that chooseth death shall die." This decree, whereby whom God "did foreknow, He did predestinate," was indeed from everlasting; this, whereby all who suffer Christ to make them alive, are "elect according to the foreknowledge of God," now standeth fast, even as the moon, and the faithful witness in heaven; and when heaven and earth shall pass away, yet this shall not pass away, for it is as unchangeable and eternal as the being of God that gave it. This decree yields the strongest encouragement to abound in all good works, and in all holiness, and it is a well-spring of joy, of happiness also, to our great and endless comfort. This is worthy of God. It is every way consistent with the perfection of His nature. It gives us the noblest view, both of His justice, mercy, and truth. To this agrees the whole scope of the Christian revelation, as well as all the parts thereof. To this Moses and all the prophets bear witness, and our blessed Lord and all His apostles. Thus Moses, in the name of his Lord, "I call heaven and earth to record against you this day, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that thou and thy seed may live." Thus Ezekiel (to cite one prophet for all), "The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear (eternally) the iniquity of the father. The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." Thus our blessed Lord, "If any man thirst, let him come to me and drink." Thus His great apostle, St Paul, "God commandeth all men, everywhere, to repent." All men, everywhere; every person, in every place,

without any exception either of place or person. Thus St James, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him." Thus St Peter, "The Lord is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." And thus St John, "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, and He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world."

Oh, hear ye this, ye that forget God! Ye cannot charge your death upon Him. "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God. Repent and turn from your transgressions, so iniquity shall not be your ruin. Cast away from you all your transgressions whereby you have transgressed; for why will ye die, O house of Israel? For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God. Wherefore turn yourselves, and live ye." "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked. Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?"

WILLIAM MURRAY,

LORD MANSFIELD.

1705-1793.

SPEECH WHEN SURROUNDED BY A MOB IN THE COURT OF THE KING'S BENCH, ON A TRIAL RESPECTING THE OUTLAWRY OF JOHN WILKES.*

[JOHN WILKES had been prosecuted in 1764 for a libel upon the king and an obscene essay on women. Verdict had been declared against him, and, as he did not appear to receive sentence, he was outlawed. Wilkes returned to England in 1768, applied to the Court of the King's Bench for a reversal of the outlawry, numerous meetings were held in his favour in the metropolis, and on the 8th of June 1768, when the decision was made public, the court was crowded by a highly-excited mob. While Lord Mansfield was engaged in reading his decision, he suddenly stopped, and addressed those present in the speech given below.]

But here let me pause.

It is fit to take some notice of various terrors being out; the numerous crowds which have attended and now attend in and about the hall, out of all reach of hearing what passes in court, and the tumults, which, in other places, have shamefully insulted all order and government. Audacious addresses in print dictate to us, from those they call the *people*, the judgment to be given now, and afterward upon the conviction. Reasons of policy are urged, from danger in the kingdom by commotions and general confusion.

Give me leave to take the opportunity of this great and respectable audience to let the whole world know *all such attempts are vain*. Unless we have been able to find an error which bears us out to reverse the outlawry, it must be affirmed. The Constitution does not allow reasons of state to influence our judgments; God forbid it should! We must not regard political consequences, how formidable soever they might be. If rebellion was the certain consequence, we are bound to say, *Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum* ["Be justice done, though heaven in ruins fall."] The Constitution trusts the king with reasons of state and policy. He may stop prosecutions; he may pardon offences; it is his to judge whether the law or the criminal shall yield. *We* have no election. None of us encouraged or approved the commission of either of the crimes of which the defendant is convicted. None of us had any hand in his being prosecuted. As to myself, I took no part (in another place) in the addresses for that prosecution. *We* did not advise or assist the defendant to fly from justice; it was his own act, and he must take the consequences. None of us have been consulted, or had anything to do with the present prosecution. It is not in our power to stop it; it was not in our power to bring it on. We cannot pardon. We are to say what we take the law to be. If we do not speak our real opinions, we prevaricate with God and our own consciences.

I pass over many anonymous letters I have received. Those in print are public, and some of them have been brought judicially before the court. Whoever the writers are, *they take the wrong way!* I will do my duty unawed. What am I to fear? That *mendax infamia* [lying scandal] from the press, which daily coins false facts and false motives? The lies of calumny carry no terror to me. I trust that the temper of my mind, and the colour and conduct of my life, have given me a suit of armour against

* Delivered June 8, 1768.

these arrows. If during this king's reign I have ever supported his government and assisted his measures, I have done it without any other reward than the consciousness of doing what I thought right. If I have ever opposed, I have done it upon the points themselves, without mixing in party or faction, and without any collateral views. I honour the king and respect the people; but many things acquired by the favour of either are, in my account, objects not worthy of ambition. I wish popularity, but it is that popularity which follows, not that which is run after. It is that popularity which, sooner or later, never fails to do justice to the pursuit of noble ends by noble means. I will not do that which my conscience tells me is wrong upon this occasion, to gain the huzzas of thousands, or the daily praise of all the papers which come from the press. I will not avoid doing what I think is right, though it should draw on me the whole artillery of libels—all that falsehood and malice can invent, or the credulity of a deluded populace can swallow. I can say with a great magistrate, upon an occasion and under circumstances not unlike, "Ego hoc animo semper fui, ut invidiam virtute partam, gloriam non invidiam, putarem" ["Such have always been my feelings, that I look upon odium incurred by the practice of virtue not as odium, but as the highest glory"].

The threats go further than abuse—personal violence is denounced. I do not believe it. It is not the genius of the worst of men of this country, in the worst of times. But I have set my mind at rest. The last end that can happen to any man never comes too soon, if he falls in support of the law and liberty of his country (for liberty is synonymous with law and government). Such a shock, too, might be productive of public good. It might awake the better part of the kingdom out of that lethargy which seems to have benumbed them, and bring the mad part back to their senses, as men intoxicated are sometimes stunned into sobriety.

Once for all, let it be understood that no endeavours of this kind will influence any man who at present sits here. If they had any effect it would be contrary to their intent; leaning against their impression might give a bias the other way. But I hope and I know that I have fortitude enough to resist even that weakness. No libels, no threats, nothing that has happened, nothing that can happen, will weigh a feather against allowing the defendant, upon this and every other question, not only the whole advantage he is entitled to from substantial law and justice, but every benefit from the most critical nicety of form which any other defendant could claim under the like objection. The only effect I feel is an anxiety to be able to explain the grounds on which we proceed, so as to satisfy all mankind "that a flaw of form given way to in this case, could not have been got over in any other."

[Lord Mansfield, along with the other judges, declared a *reversal*, adding, "I beg to be understood that I ground my opinion *singly* on the authority of the cases adjudged, which, as they are on the favourable side, in a criminal case highly penal, I think ought not to be departed from." This reversal did not free Wilkes from the operations of the verdicts formerly declared against him, and ten days after, Mr Justice Yates pronounced the judgment of the court, sentencing him to be imprisoned for twenty-two months, and to pay a fine of one thousand pounds.]

ON A BILL TO DEPRIVE PEERS OF CERTAIN PRIVILEGES.*

My Lords,—When I consider the importance of this bill to your Lordships, I am not surprised it has taken so much of your consideration. It is a bill, indeed, of no common magnitude. It is no less than to take away from two-thirds of the legislative body of this great kingdom certain privileges and immunities of which they have been long possessed. Perhaps there is no situation the human mind can be placed in, that is so difficult, and so trying, as where it is made a judge in its own cause. There is something implanted in the breast of man so attached to itself, so tenacious of privileges once obtained, that in such a situation, either to discuss with impartiality, or decide with justice, has ever been held as the summit of all human virtue. The bill now in question puts your Lordships in this very predicament; and I doubt not but the wisdom of your decision will convince the world, that where self-interest and justice are in opposite scales, the latter will ever preponderate with your Lordships.

Privileges have been granted to legislators in all ages and in all countries. The practice is founded in wisdom; and, indeed, it is peculiarly essential to the Constitution of this country, that the members of both Houses should be free in their persons in cases of civil suits; for there may come a time when the safety and welfare of this whole empire may depend upon their attendance in Parliament. God forbid that I should advise any measure that would in future endanger the state. But the bill before your Lordships has, I am confident, no such tendency, for it expressly secures the *persons* of members of either House in all civil suits. This being the case, I confess, when I see many noble lords, for whose judgment I have the greatest respect, standing up to oppose a bill which is calculated merely to facilitate the recovery of just and legal debts, I am astonished and amazed. They, I doubt not, oppose the bill upon public principles. I would not wish to insinuate that private interest has the least weight in their determination.

* Delivered in the House of Lords, May 9. 1770.

This bill has been frequently proposed, and as frequently miscarried; but it was always lost in the Lower House. Little did I think, when it had passed the Commons, that it possibly could have met with such opposition here. Shall it be said that you, my Lords, the grand council of the nation, the highest judicial and legislative body of the realm, endeavour to evade by *privilege* those very laws which you enforce on your fellow-subjects? Forbid it, justice. I am sure, were the noble lords as well acquainted as I am with but half the difficulties and delays that are every day occasioned in the courts of justice, under pretence of privilege, they would not, nay, they could not, oppose this bill.

I have waited with patience to hear what arguments might be urged against the bill; but I have waited in vain. The truth is, there is no argument that can weigh against it. The justice and expediency of this bill are such as render it self-evident. It is a proposition of that nature that can neither be weakened by argument, nor entangled with sophistry. Much, indeed, has been said by some noble lords, on the wisdom of our ancestors, and how differently they thought from us. They not only decreed that privilege should prevent all civil suits from proceeding during the sitting of Parliament, but likewise granted protection to the very servants of members. I shall say nothing on the wisdom of our ancestors. It might perhaps appear invidious, and is not necessary in the present case. I shall only say that the noble lords that flatter themselves with the weight of that reflection, should remember that, as circumstances alter, things themselves should alter. Formerly it was not so fashionable either for masters or servants to run in debt as it is at present; nor formerly were merchants or manufacturers members of Parliament, as at present. The case now is very different. Both merchants and manufacturers are, with great propriety, elected members of the Lower House. Commerce having thus got into the legislative body of the kingdom, privilege must be done away. We all know that the very soul and essence of trade are regular payments: and sad experience teaches us that there are men who will not make their regular payments without the compulsive power of the laws. The law, then, ought to be equally open to all. Any exemption to particular men, or particular ranks of men, is, in a free commercial country, a solecism of the grossest nature.

But I will not trouble your Lordships with arguments for that which is sufficiently evident without any. I shall only say a few words to some noble lords, who foresee much inconvenience from the persons of their servants being liable to be arrested. One noble lord observes, that the coachman of a peer may be arrested while he is driving his master to the House, and consequently he will not be able to attend his duty in Parliament. If this was actually to happen, there are so many methods by which the member might still get to the House, I can hardly think the noble lord to be serious in his objection. Another noble lord said that by this bill one might lose his most valuable and honest servants. This I hold to be a contradiction in terms; for he neither can be a valuable servant, nor an honest man, who gets into debt which he neither is able nor willing to pay till compelled by law. If my servant, by unforeseen accidents, has got in debt, and I still wish to retain him, I certainly would pay the debt. But upon no principle of liberal legislation whatever can my servant have a title to set his creditors at defiance, while, for forty shillings only, the honest tradesman may be torn from his family and locked up in gaol. It is monstrous injustice! I flatter myself, however, the determination of this day will entirely put an end to all such partial proceedings for the future, by passing into a law the bill now under your Lordships' consideration.

I now come to speak upon what, indeed, I would have gladly avoided, had I not been particularly *pointed* at for the part I have taken in this bill. It has been said by a noble lord on my left hand that I likewise am running the race of popularity. If the noble lord means by popularity that applause bestowed by after-ages on good and virtuous actions, I have long been struggling in that race, to what purpose all-trying time can alone determine. But if the noble lord means that mushroom popularity which is raised without merit, and lost without a crime, he is much mistaken in his opinion. I defy the noble lord to point out a single action in my life where the popularity of the times ever had the smallest influence on my determinations. I thank God I have a more permanent and steady rule for my conduct—the dictates of my own breast. Those that have foregone that pleasing adviser, and given up their mind to be the slave of every popular impulse, I sincerely pity. I pity them still more if their vanity leads them to mistake the shouts of a mob for the trumpet of their fame. Experience might inform them that many who have been saluted with the huzzas of a crowd one day, have received their execrations the next; and many who, by the popularity of their times, have been held up as spotless patriots, have nevertheless appeared upon the historian's page, when truth has triumphed over delusion, the assassins of liberty.

Why, then, the noble lord can think I am ambitious of present popularity, that echo of folly and shadow of renown, I am at a loss to determine. Besides, I do not know that the bill now before your Lordships will be popular. It depends much upon the caprice of the day. It may not be popular to compel people to pay their debts; and in that case the present must be an unpopular bill. It may not be popular, neither, to take away any of the privileges of Parliament;

for I very well remember, and many of your Lordships may remember, that not long ago the popular cry was for the extension of privilege. And so far did they carry it at that time, that it was said that privilege protected members from criminal actions; nay, such was the power of popular prejudices over weak minds, that the very decisions of some of the courts were tinctured with that doctrine. It was undoubtedly an abominable doctrine. I thought so then, and think so still. But, nevertheless, it was a popular doctrine, and came immediately from those who were called the friends of liberty, how deservedly time will show. True liberty, in my opinion, can only exist when justice is equally administered to all—to the king and to the beggar. Where is the justice, then, or where is the law, that protects a member of Parliament more than any other man from the punishment due to his crimes? The laws of this country allow no place nor employment to be a sanctuary for crimes; and, where I have the honour to sit as judge, neither royal favour nor popular applause shall ever protect the guilty.

I have now only to beg pardon for having employed so much of your Lordships' time; and I am very sorry a bill, fraught with so good consequences, has not met with an abler advocate; but I doubt not your Lordships' determination will convince the world that a bill, calculated to contribute so much to the equal distribution of justice as the present, requires, with your Lordships, but very little support.

[The Act was finally passed.]

WILLIAM PITT,

LORD CHATHAM.*

1708-1778.

AGAINST SEARCH-WARRANTS FOR SEAMEN.†

[In consequence of the declaration of war with Spain, sailors were urgently required to man the British fleets; Sir Charles Wager had brought in a bill in January 1741, which would give authority to Justices of the Peace to issue search-warrants, and impress men into the service.]

Sir,—The two honourable and learned gentlemen who spoke in favour of this clause, were pleased to show that our seamen are half slaves already, and now they modestly desire you should make them *wholly so*. Will this increase your number of seamen? or will it make those you have more willing to serve you? Can you expect that any man will make himself a slave if he can avoid it? Can you expect that any man will breed his child up to be a slave? Can you expect that seamen will venture their lives or their limbs for a country that has made them slaves? or can you expect that any seaman will stay in the country, if he can by any means make his escape? Sir, if you pass this law, you must, in my opinion, do with your seamen as they do with their galley-slaves in France—you must chain them to their ships, or chain them in couples when they are ashore. But suppose this should both increase the number of your seamen, and render them more willing to serve you, it will render them incapable. It is a common observation, that when a man becomes a slave, he loses half his virtue. What will it signify to have your ships all manned to their full complement? Your men will have neither the courage nor the temptation to fight; they will strike to the first enemy that attacks them, because their condition cannot be made worse by a surrender. Our seamen have always been

---

* "The intellect of Chatham was of the highest order, and was peculiarly fitted for the broad and rapid combinations of oratory. It was at once comprehensive, acute, and vigorous, enabling him to embrace the largest range of thought, to see at a glance what most men labour out by slow degrees, and to grasp his subject with a vigour and hold on to it with a firmness which have rarely, if ever, been equalled. But his intellect never acted alone. It was impossible for him to speak on any subject in a dry or abstract manner; all the operations of his mind were pervaded and governed by intense feeling."—*C. A. Goodrich.*

"In the mind of Chatham, the great substantial truths of common sense, the leading maxims of the constitution, the real interests and general feelings of mankind, were in a manner embodied. He comprehended the whole of his subject at a single glance—everything was firmly riveted to its place; there was no feebleness, no forgetfulness, no pause, no distraction; the ardour of his mind overcame every obstacle, and he crushed the sophisms of his adversaries as we crush an insect under our feet. His imagination was of the same character with his understanding, and was under the same guidance. . . . It never forgot its errand, but went straight forward, like an arrow to its mark, with an unerring aim. It was his servant, not his master."—*Hazlitt's Eloquence of the British Senate.*

† A speech delivered in the House of Commons, March 6, 1741.

famous for a matchless alacrity and intrepidity in time of danger; this has saved many a British ship, when other seamen would have run below deck, and left the ship to the mercy of the waves, or, perhaps, of a more cruel enemy, a pirate. For God's sake, sir, let us not, by our new projects, put our seamen into such a condition as must soon make them worse than the cowardly slaves of France or Spain.

The learned gentlemen were next pleased to show us that the Government were already possessed of such a power as is now desired. And how did they show it? Why, sir, by showing that this was the practice in the case of felony, and in the case of those who are as bad as felons, I mean those who rob the public, or dissipate the public money. Shall we, sir, put our brave sailors upon the same footing with felons and public robbers? Shall a brave honest sailor be treated as a felon, for no other reason but because, after a long voyage, he has a mind to solace himself among his friends in the country, and for that purpose absconds for a few weeks, in order to prevent his being pressed upon a Spithead, or some such pacific expedition? For I dare answer for it, there is not a sailor in Britain but would immediately offer his services, if he thought his country in any real danger, or expected to be sent upon an expedition where he might have a chance of gaining riches to himself and glory to his country. I am really ashamed, sir, to hear such arguments made use of in any case where our seamen are concerned. Can we expect that brave men will not resent such treatment? Could we expect they would stay with us, if we should make a law for treating them in such a contemptible manner?

But suppose, sir, we had no regard for our seamen, I hope we shall have some regard for the rest of the people, and for ourselves in particular; for I think I do not in the least exaggerate when I say, we are laying a trap for the lives of all the men of spirit in the nation. Whether the law, when made, is to be carried into execution, I do not know; but if it is, we are laying a snare for our own lives. Every gentleman of this House must be supposed, I hope justly, to be a man of spirit. Would any of you, gentlemen, allow this law to be executed in its full extent? If, at midnight, a petty constable, with a press-gang, should come thundering at the gates of your house in the country, and should tell you he had a search-warrant, and must search your house for seamen, would you at that time of night allow your gates to be opened? I protest I would not. What then would be the consequence? He has by this law a power to break them open. Would any of you patiently submit to such an indignity? Would not you fire upon him, if he attempted to break open your gates? I declare I would, let the consequence be never so fatal, and if you happened to be in the bad graces of a minister, the consequence would be your being either killed in the fray, or hanged for killing the constable or some of his gang. This, sir, may be the case of even some of us here; and, upon my honour, I do not think it an exaggeration to suppose it may.

The honourable gentlemen say no other remedy has been proposed. Sir, there have been several other remedies proposed. Let us go into a committee to consider of what has been, or may be proposed. Suppose no other remedy should be offered, to tell us we must take this, because no other remedy can be thought of, is the same with a physician's telling his patient, "Sir, there is no known remedy for your distemper, therefore you shall take poison—I'll cram it down your throat." I do not know how the nation may treat its physicians, but I am sure if my physician told me so, I should order my servants to turn him out of doors.

Such desperate remedies, sir, are never to be applied but in cases of the utmost extremity, and how we come at present to be in such extremity I cannot comprehend. In the time of Queen Elizabeth we were not thought to be in any such extremity, though we were then threatened with the most formidable invasion that was ever prepared against this nation. In our wars with the Dutch, a more formidable maritime power than France and Spain now would be, if they were united against us, we were not supposed to be in any such extremity, either in the time of the Commonwealth or of King Charles II. In King William's war against France, when her naval power was vastly superior to what it is at present, and when we had more reason to be afraid of an invasion than we can have at present, we were thought to be in no such extremity. In Queen Anne's time, when we were engaged in a war both against France and Spain, and were obliged to make great levies yearly for the land service, no such remedy was ever thought of, except for one year only, and then it was found to be far from being effectual.

This, sir, I am convinced would be the case now, as well as it was then. It was at that time computed that, by means of such a law as this, there were not above fourteen hundred seamen brought into the service of the Government, and, considering the methods that have been already taken, and the reward proposed by this bill to be offered to volunteers, I am convinced that the most strict and general search would not bring in half the number. Shall we, then, for the sake of adding six or seven hundred, or even fourteen hundred seamen to his Majesty's navy, expose our Constitution to so much danger, and every housekeeper in the kingdom to the danger of being disturbed at all hours in the night?

But suppose this law were to have a great effect, it can be called nothing but a temporary expedient, because it can in no way contribute

toward increasing the number of our seamen, or toward rendering them more willing to enter into his Majesty's service. It is an observation made by Bacon upon the laws passed in Henry VII.'s reign, that all of them were calculated for futurity as well as the present time. This showed the wisdom of his councils; I wish I could say so of our present. We have for some years thought of nothing but expedients for getting rid of some present inconvenience by running ourselves into a greater. The ease or convenience of posterity was never less thought of, I believe, than it has been of late years. I wish I could see an end of these temporary expedients; for we have been pursuing them so long that we have almost undone our country and overturned our Constitution. Therefore, sir, I shall be for leaving this clause out of the bill, and every other clause relating to it. The bill will be of some service without them, and when we have passed it, we may then go into a committee to consider of some lasting methods for increasing our stock of seamen, and for encouraging them upon all occasions to enter into his Majesty's service.

[In consequence of these remarks, all the clauses relating to search-warrants were ultimately struck out of the bill. His speech on this occasion produced an answer from Mr H. Walpcle, who in the course of it said: "Formidable sounds and furious declamation, confident assertions and lofty periods, may affect the young and inexperienced; and perhaps the honourable gentleman may have contracted his habits of oratory by conversing more with those of his own age than with such as have had more opportunities of acquiring knowledge, and more successful methods of communicating their sentiments." Mr Walpole added some expressions such as vehemence of gesture, theatrical emotion, etc., which he applied to Mr Pitt's manner of speaking. As soon as he sat down Mr Pitt rose, and made the following reply, which, although it has had the misfortune of being turned into Johnsonese by Dr Johnson, who wrote it out from what was reported to him, yet contains the general sentiments expressed.]

REPLY OF LORD CHATHAM WHEN ATTACKED BY HORATIO WALPOLE.*

SIR,—The atrocious crime of being a young man, which the honourable gentleman has, with such spirit and decency, charged upon me, I shall neither attempt to palliate nor deny, but content myself with wishing that I may be one of those whose follies may cease with their youth, and not of that number who are ignorant in spite of experience. Whether youth can be imputed to any man as a reproach, I will not, sir, assume the province of determining; but surely age may become justly contemptible, if the opportunities which it brings have passed away without improvement, and vice appears to prevail when the passions have subsided. The wretch who, after having seen the consequences of a thousand errors, continues still to blunder, and whose age has only added obstinacy to stupidity, is surely the object of either abhorrence or contempt, and deserves not that his grey hairs should secure him from insult. Much more, sir, is he to be abhorred, who, as he has advanced in age, has receded from virtue, and becomes more wicked with less temptation; who prostitutes himself for money which he cannot enjoy, and spends the remains of his life in the ruin of his country. But youth, sir, is not my only crime; I have been accused of acting a theatrical part. A theatrical part may either imply some peculiarities of gesture, or a dissimulation of my real sentiments, and an adoption of the opinions and language of another man.

In the first sense, sir, the charge is too trifling to be confuted, and deserves only to be mentioned to be despised. I am at liberty, like every other man, to use my own language; and though, perhaps, I may have some ambition to please this gentleman, I shall not lay myself under any restraint, nor very solicitously copy *his* diction or *his* mien, however matured by age, or modelled by experience. If any man shall, by charging me with theatrical behaviour, imply that I utter any sentiments but my own, I shall treat him as a calumniator and a villain; nor shall any protection shelter him from the treatment he deserves. I shall, on such an occasion, without scruple, trample upon all those forms with which wealth and dignity entrench themselves, nor shall anything but age restrain my resentment—age, which always brings one privilege, that of being insolent and supercilious without punishment. But with regard, sir, to those whom I have offended, I am of opinion, that if I had acted a borrowed part, I should have avoided their censure. The heat that offended them is the ardour of conviction, and that zeal for the service of my country which neither hope nor fear shall influence me to suppress. I will not sit unconcerned while my liberty is invaded, nor look in silence upon public robbery. I will exert my endeavours, at whatever hazard, to repel the aggressor, and drag the thief to justice, whoever may protect them in their villainy, and whoever may partake of their plunder. And if the honourable gentleman— —

[At this point Mr Pitt was called to order by Mr Wynnington, who went on to say: "No diversity of opinion can justify the violation of decency, and the use of rude and virulent expressions, dictated only by resentment, and uttered without regard to——"

Here Mr Pitt called to order, and proceeded thus:] Sir, if this be to preserve order, there is

* Delivered March 6, 1741.

no danger of indecency from the most licentious tongues. For what calumny can be more atrocious, what reproach more severe, than that of speaking with regard to anything but truth. Order may sometimes be broken by passion or inadvertency, but will hardly be re-established by a monitor like this, who cannot govern his own passions while he is restraining the impetuosity of others.

Happy would it be for mankind if every one knew his own province. We should not then see the same man at once a criminal and a judge; nor would this gentleman assume the right of dictating to others what he has not learned himself.

That I may return in some degree the favour he intends me, I will advise him *never hereafter to exert himself on the subject of order;* but whenever he feels inclined to speak on such occasions, to remember how he has now succeeded, and condemn in silence what his censures will never amend.

ON AN ADDRESS TO THE THRONE, IN WHICH THE RIGHT OF TAXING AMERICA IS DISCUSSED.

[During the Grenville administration between 1763-65, the plan for levying taxes on the American colonies was brought forward in the shape of the Stamp Act, which was passed on the 22d March 1765. Charles Townsend spoke against the Americans as "children planted by our care, nourished by our indulgence, and protected by our arms," etc. Colonel Barré was strongly opposed to it, and said in reply: "*They* planted by your care? No! Your oppressions planted them in America. They fled from your tyranny to a then uncultivated and inhospitable country, where they exposed themselves to almost all the hardships to which human nature is liable, and, among others, to the cruelties of a savage foe, the most subtle and, I will take it upon me to say, the most formidable of any people on earth; and yet, actuated by principles of true English liberty, they met all hardships with pleasure, compared with those they suffered in their native land from the hands of those who should have been their friends. They nourished by your indulgence? They grew by your neglect of them? As soon as you began to care about them, that care was exercised in sending persons to rule them, who were, perhaps, the deputies of deputies to some members of this House—sent to spy out their liberties, to misrepresent their actions, and to prey upon them—men promoted to the highest seats of justice, some of whom, to my knowledge, were glad, by going to a foreign country, to escape being brought to the bar of a court of justice in their own. They protected by your arms? They have nobly taken up arms in your defence; have exerted a valour, amid their constant and laborious industry, for the defence of a country whose frontier was drenched in blood, while its interior yielded all its little savings to your emolument. And, believe me—remember I this day told you so—that same spirit of freedom which actuated that people at first will accompany them still. But prudence forbids me to say more. God knows I do not at this time speak from motives of party heat. What I deliver are the genuine sentiments of my heart. However superior to me in general knowledge and experience the respectable body of this House may be, I claim to know more of America than most of you, having seen and been conversant with that country. The people are, I believe, as truly loyal as any subjects the king has, but a people jealous of their liberties, and who will vindicate them if they should ever be violated."

The colonies rose in open resistance. The news of this resistance reached England at the close of 1765, and Parliament was summoned on the 17th of December. The plan of the ministry was to repeal the Stamp Act, but, in accordance with the king's wishes, to re-assert (in doing so) the right of Parliament to tax the colonies. Against this course Pitt took his stand; and when the address was made in answer to the king's speech, he spoke as follows on the subject of American taxation.]

MR SPEAKER,—I came to town but to-day. I was a stranger to the tenor of his Majesty's speech and the proposed address till I heard them read in this House. Unconnected and unconsulted, I have not the means of information. I am fearful of offending through mistake, and therefore beg to be indulged with a second reading of the proposed address. [The address being read, Mr Pitt went on:] I commend the king's speech, and approve of the address in answer, as it decides nothing, every gentleman being left at perfect liberty to take such a part concerning America as he may afterward see fit. One word only I cannot approve of—an "early" is a word that does not belong to the notice the ministry have given to Parliament of the troubles in America. In a matter of such importance, the communication ought to have been *immediate*.

I speak not now with respect to parties. I stand up in this place single and independent. As to the late ministry [turning himself to Mr Grenville, who sat within one of him], every capital measure they have taken has been entirely wrong! As to the present gentlemen, to those at least whom I have in my eye [looking at the bench where General Conway sat with the lords of the treasury], I have no objection. I have never been made a sacrifice by any of them. Their characters are fair; and I am always glad

* A Speech delivered in the House of Commons, January 14, 1766

when men of fair character engage in his Majesty's service. Some of them did me the honour to ask my opinion before they would engage. These will now do me the justice to own I advised them to do it; but, notwithstanding (for I love to be explicit), *I cannot give them my confidence.* Pardon me, gentlemen [bowing to the ministry], confidence is a plant of slow growth in an aged bosom. Youth is the season of credulity. By comparing events with each other, reasoning from effects to causes, methinks I plainly discover the traces of an *overruling* influence.

There is a clause in the Act of Settlement obliging every minister to sign his name to the advice which he gives to his sovereign. Would it were observed! I have had the honour to serve the Crown, and if I could have submitted to *influence*, I might have still continued to serve; but I would not be responsible for others. I have no local attachments. It is indifferent to me whether a man was rocked in his cradle on this side or that side of the Tweed. I sought for merit wherever it was to be found. It is my boast that I was the first minister who looked for it, and found it, in the mountains of the North. I called it forth, and drew into your service a hardy and intrepid race of men—men who, when left by your jealousy, became a prey to the artifices of your enemies, and had gone nigh to have overturned the state in the war before the last. These men, in the last war, were brought to combat on your side. They served with fidelity, as they fought with valour, and conquered for you in every part of the world. Detested be the national reflections against them! They are unjust, groundless, illiberal, unmanly! When I ceased to serve his Majesty as a minister, it was not the *country* of the man by which I was moved—but the *man* of that country wanted wisdom, and held principles incompatible with freedom.*

It is a long time, Mr Speaker, since I have attended in Parliament. When the resolution was taken in this House to tax America, I was ill in bed. If I could have endured to be carried in my bed—so great was the agitation of my mind for the consequences—I would have solicited some kind hand to have laid me down on this floor, to have borne my testimony against it. It is now an Act that has passed. I would speak with decency of every Act of this House, but I must beg the indulgence of the House to speak of it with freedom.

I hope a day may soon be appointed to consider the state of the nation with respect to America. I hope gentlemen will come to this debate with all the temper and impartiality that his Majesty recommends, and the importance of the subject requires; a subject of greater importance than ever engaged the attention of this House—that subject only excepted when, near a century ago,* it was the question whether you yourselves were to be bond or free. In the meantime, as I cannot depend upon my health for any future day (such is the nature of my infirmities), I will beg to say a few words at present, leaving the justice, the equity, the policy, the expediency of the Act to another time.

I will only speak to one point, a point which seems not to have been generally understood—I mean to the *right*. Some gentlemen [alluding to Mr Nugent] seem to have considered it as a point of honour. If gentlemen consider it in that light, they leave all measures of right and wrong to follow a delusion that may lead to destruction. It is my opinion that this kingdom has no right to lay a tax upon the colonies. At the same time, I assert the authority of this kingdom over the colonies to be sovereign and supreme, in every circumstance of government and legislation whatsoever. They are the subjects of this kingdom, equally entitled with yourselves to all the natural rights of mankind and the peculiar privileges of Englishmen; equally bound by its laws, and equally participating in the constitution of this free country. The Americans are the sons, not the bastards of England. Taxation is no part of the governing or legislative power. The taxes are a voluntary *gift* and *grant* of the Commons alone. In legislation the three estates of the realm are alike concerned; but the concurrence of the peers and the Crown to a tax is only necessary to clothe it with the form of a law. The gift and grant is of the Commons alone. In ancient days, the Crown, the barons, and the clergy possessed the lands. In those days the barons and the clergy gave and granted to the Crown. They gave and granted what was their own! At present, since the discovery of America, and other circumstances permitting, the Commons are become the proprietors of the land. The Church (God bless it) has but a pittance. The property of the lords, compared with that of the Commons, is as a drop of water in the ocean; and this House represents those Commons, the proprietors of the lands, and those proprietors virtually represent the rest of the inhabitants. When, therefore, in this House, we give and grant, we give and grant what is our own. But in an American tax, what do we do? "We, your Majesty's Commons for Great Britain, give and grant to your Majesty"—what? Our own property? No! "We give and grant to your Majesty" the property of your Majesty's Commons of America! It is an absurdity in terms.

The distinction between legislation and taxation is essentially necessary to liberty. The Crown and the peers are equally legislative powers with the Commons. If taxation be a

* In allusion to Lord Bute, who is aimed at throughout the whole of these two paragraphs.

* At the Revolution of 1688.

part of simple legislation, the Crown and the peers have rights in taxation as well as yourselves—rights which they will claim, which they will exercise, whenever the principle can be supported by power.

There is an idea in some that the colonies are *virtually* represented in the House. I would fain know by whom an American is represented here. Is he represented by any knight of the shire, in any county in this kingdom? *Would to God that respectable representation was augmented to a greater number.* Or will you tell him that he is represented by any representative of a borough? a borough, which, perhaps, its own representatives never saw. This is what is called *the rotten part of the Constitution.* It cannot continue a century. If it does not drop, it must be amputated.* The idea of a virtual representation of America in this House is the most contemptible idea that ever entered into the head of a man. It does not deserve a serious refutation.

The Commons of America, represented in their several assemblies, have ever been in possession of the exercise of this their constitutional right of giving and granting their own money. They would have been slaves if they had not enjoyed it. At the same time, this kingdom, as the supreme governing and legislative power, has always bound the colonies by her laws, by her regulations, and restrictions in trade, in navigation, in manufactures, in everything except that of taking their money out of their pockets without their consent.

Here I would draw the line,

"Quam ultra citraque neque consistere rectum."
["On neither side of which we can rightly stand."]

When Lord Chatham had concluded, General Conway rose, and avowed his complete approval of that part of the previous speech which related to American affairs, but denied altogether that "secret overruling influence which had been hinted at." Mr George Grenville also spoke on the tumults and riots which had taken place in the colonies, and declared that they bordered on rebellion. "I cannot," said Mr Grenville, "understand the difference between external and internal taxes. They are the same in effect, and differ only in name. That this kingdom has the sovereign, the supreme legislative power over America, is granted; it cannot be denied; and taxation is a part of that sovereign power. It is one branch of the legislation. It is, it has been, exercised over those who are not, who were never represented. It is exercised over the India Company, the merchants of London, the proprietors of the stocks, and over many great manufacturing towns. It was exercised over the county palatine of Chester, and the bishopric of Durham, before they sent any representatives to Parliament. I appeal for proof to the preambles of the Acts which gave them representatives; one in the reign of Henry VIII., the other in that of Charles II." Mr Grenville then quoted the Acts, and desired that they might be read; which being done, he said: "When I proposed to tax America, I asked the House if any gentleman would object to the right; I repeatedly asked it, and no man would attempt to deny it. Protection and obedience are reciprocal. Great Britain protects America; America is bound to yield obedience. If not, tell me when the Americans were emancipated. When they want the protection of this kingdom, they are always very ready to ask it. That protection has always been afforded them in the most full and ample manner. The nation has run herself into an immense debt to give them their protection; and now, when they are called upon to contribute a small share toward the public expense—an expense arising from themselves—they renounce your authority, insult your officers, and break out, I might almost say, into open rebellion. The seditious spirit of the colonies owes its birth to the factions in this House. Gentlemen are careless of the consequences of what they say, provided it answers the purposes of opposition. We were told we trod on tender ground. We were bid to expect disobedience. What is this but telling the Americans to stand out against the law, to encourage their obstinacy with the expectation of support from hence? 'Let us only hold out a little,' they would say, 'our friends will soon be in power.' Ungrateful people of America! Bounties have been extended to them. When I had the honour of serving the Crown, while you yourselves were loaded with an enormous debt, you gave bounties on their lumber, on their iron, their hemp, and many other articles. You have relaxed in their favour the Act of Navigation, that palladium of the British commerce; and yet I have been abused in all the public papers as an enemy to the trade of America. I have been particularly charged with giving orders and instructions to prevent the Spanish trade, and thereby stopping the channel by which alone North America used to be supplied with cash for remittances to this country. I defy any man to produce any such orders or instructions. I discouraged no trade but what was illicit, what was prohibited by an Act of Parliament. I desire a West India merchant (Mr Long), well known in the city, a gentleman of character, may be examined. He will tell you that I offered to do everything in my power to advance the trade of America. I was above giving an answer to anonymous calumnies; but in this place it becomes one to wipe off the aspersion."

* "We have here the first mention made by any English statesman of a *reform* in the borough system. A great truth once uttered never dies. The Reform Bill of Earl Grey had its origin in the mind of Chatham."—*Goodrich.*

[Here Grenville stopped, and Pitt was clamorously called upon to speak.]

Mr Pitt said—I do not apprehend I am speaking twice. I did expressly reserve a part of my subject, in order to save the time of this House; but I am compelled to proceed in it. I do not speak twice; I only finish what I designedly left imperfect. But if the House is of a different opinion, far be it from me to indulge a wish of transgression against order. I am content, if it be your pleasure to be silent. [Here he paused. The House resounding with *Go on! go on!* he proceeded:]

Gentlemen, sir, have been charged with giving birth to *sedition* in America. They have spoken their sentiments with freedom against this unhappy act, and that freedom has become their crime. Sorry I am to hear the liberty of speech in this House imputed as a crime. But the imputation shall not discourage me. It is a liberty I mean to exercise. No gentleman ought to be afraid to exercise it. It is a liberty by which the gentleman who calumniates it might have profited. He ought to have desisted from his project. The gentleman tells us America is obstinate; America is almost in open rebellion. I rejoice that America has resisted. Three millions of people, so dead to all the feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves, would have been fit instruments to make slaves of the rest. I come not here armed at all points with law cases and Acts of Parliament, with the statute book doubled down in dogs' ears, to defend the cause of liberty. If I had, I myself would have cited the two cases of Chester and Durham. I would have cited them to show that, even under former arbitrary reigns, Parliaments were ashamed of taxing a people without their consent, and allowed them representatives. Why did the gentleman confine himself to Chester and Durham? He might have taken a higher example in Wales—Wales, that never was taxed by Parliament till it was incorporated. I would not debate a particular point of law with the gentleman. I know his abilities. I have been obliged to his diligent researches. But, for the defence of liberty, upon a general principle, upon a constitutional principle, it is a ground on which I stand firm—on which I dare meet any man. The gentleman tells us of many who are taxed, and are not represented—the India Company, merchants, stockholders, manufacturers. Surely many of these are represented in other capacities, as owners of land, or as freemen of boroughs. It is a misfortune that more are not equally represented. But they are all inhabitants, and, as such, are they not virtually represented? Many have it in their option to be actually represented. They have connections with those that elect, and they have influence over them. The gentleman mentioned the stockholders. I hope he does not reckon the debts of the nation as a part of the national estate.

Since the accession of King William, many ministers, some of great, others of more moderate abilities, have taken the lead of government. [Here Mr Pitt went through the list of them, bringing it down till he came to himself, giving a short sketch of the characters of each, and then proceeded:] None of these thought, or even dreamed of robbing the colonies of their constitutional rights. That was reserved to mark the era of the late administration. Not that there were wanting some, when I had the honour to serve his Majesty, to propose to me to burn my fingers with an American Stamp Act. With the enemy at their back, with our bayonets at their breasts, in the day of their distress, perhaps the Americans would have submitted to the imposition; but it would have been taking an ungenerous, an unjust advantage. The gentleman boasts of his bounties to America! Are not these bounties intended finally for the benefit of this kingdom? If they are not, he has misapplied the national treasures!

I am no courtier of America. I stand up for this kingdom. I maintain that the Parliament has a right to bind, to restrain America. Our legislative power over the colonies is sovereign and supreme. When it ceases to be sovereign and supreme, I would advise every gentleman to sell his lands, if he can, and embark for that country. When two countries are connected together like England and her colonies, without being incorporated, the one must necessarily govern. The greater must rule the less. But she must so rule it as not to contradict the fundamental principles that are common to both.

If the gentleman does not understand the difference between external and internal taxes, I cannot help it. There is a plain distinction between taxes levied for the purposes of raising a revenue, and duties imposed for the regulation of trade, for the accommodation of the subject; although, in the consequences, some revenue may incidentally arise from the latter.

The gentleman asks, when were the colonies emancipated? I desire to know, when were they made slaves? But I dwell not upon words. When I had the honour of serving his Majesty, I availed myself of the means of information which I derived from my office. I speak, therefore, from knowledge. My materials were good. I was at pains to collect, to digest, to consider them; and I will be bold to affirm, that the profits to Great Britain from the trade of the colonies, through all its branches, is two millions a year. This is the fund that carried you triumphantly through the last war. The estates that were rented at two thousand pounds a year, threescore years ago, are at three thousand at present. Those estates sold then from fifteen to eighteen years' purchase; the same may now be sold for thirty. You owe this to America. This is the price America pays you for her protection. And shall a miserable financier come with a

boast, that he can bring "a pepper-corn" into the exchequer by the loss of millions to the nation? I dare not say how much higher these profits may be augmented. Omitting the immense increase of people, by natural population, in the northern colonies, and the emigration from every part of Europe, I am convinced [on other grounds] that the commercial system of America may be altered to advantage. You have prohibited where you ought to have encouraged. You have encouraged where you ought to have prohibited. Improper restraints have been laid on the continent in favour of the islands. You have but two nations to trade with in America. Would you had twenty! Let Acts of Parliament in consequence of treaties remain; but let not an English minister become a custom-house officer for Spain, or for any foreign power. Much is wrong! Much may be amended for the general good of the whole!

Does the gentleman complain he has been misrepresented in the public prints? It is a common misfortune. In the Spanish affair of the last war, I was abused in all the newspapers for having advised his Majesty to violate the laws of nations with regard to Spain. The abuse was industriously circulated even in handbills. If administration did not propagate the abuse, administration never contradicted it. I will not say what advice I did give the king. My advice is in writing, signed by myself, in the possession of the Crown. But I will say what advice I did not give to the king. I did *not* advise him to violate any of the laws of nations.

As to the report of the gentleman's preventing in some way the trade for bullion with the Spaniards, it was spoken of so confidently that I own I am one of those who did believe it to be true.

The gentleman must not wonder he was not contradicted when, as minister, he asserted the right of Parliament to tax America. I know not how it is, but there is a modesty in this House which does not choose to contradict a minister. Even your chair, sir, looks too often toward St James's. I wish gentlemen would get the better of this modesty. If they do not, perhaps the collective body may begin to abate of its respect for the representative. Lord Bacon has told me, that a great question would not fail of being agitated at one time or another. I was willing to agitate such a question at the proper season, viz., that of the German war—*my* German war, they called it! Every session I called out, Has anybody any objection to the German war? Nobody would object to it, one gentleman only excepted, since removed to the Upper House by succession to an ancient barony [Lord Le Despencer, formerly Sir Francis Dashwood]. He told me he did not like a German war. I honoured the man for it, and was sorry when he was turned out of his post.

A great deal has been said without doors of the power, of the strength of America. It is a topic that ought to be cautiously meddled with. In a good cause, on a sound bottom, the force of this country can crush America to atoms. I know the valour of your troops. I know the skill of your officers. There is not a company of foot that has served in America, out of which you may not pick a man of sufficient knowledge and experience to make a governor of a colony there. But on this ground, on the Stamp Act, which so many here will think a crying injustice, I am one who will lift up my hands against it.

In such a cause, your success would be hazardous. America, if she fell, would fall like the strong man; she would embrace the pillars of the State, and pull down the Constitution along with her. Is this your boasted peace—not to sheathe the sword in its scabbard, but to sheathe it in the bowels of your countrymen? Will you quarrel with yourselves, now the whole house of Bourbon is united against you; while France disturbs your fisheries in Newfoundland, embarrasses your slave trade to Africa, and withholds from your subjects in Canada their property stipulated by treaty; while the ransom for the Manillas is denied by Spain, and its gallant conqueror basely traduced into a mean plunderer! a gentleman (Colonel Draper) whose noble and generous spirit would do honour to the proudest grandee of the country? The Americans have not acted in all things with prudence and temper: they have been wronged; they have been driven to madness by injustice. Will you punish them for the madness you have occasioned? Rather let prudence and temper come first from this side. I will undertake for America that she will follow the example. There are two lines in a ballad of Prior's, of a man's behaviour to his wife, so applicable to you and your colonies, that I cannot help repeating them:

> "Be to her faults a little blind;
> Be to her virtues very kind."

Upon the whole, I will beg leave to tell the House what is my opinion. It is, that the Stamp Act be repealed absolutely, totally, and immediately. That the reason for the repeal be assigned, viz., because it was founded on an erroneous principle. At the same time, let the sovereign authority of this country over the colonies be asserted in as strong terms as can be devised, and be made to extend to every point of legislation whatsoever; that we may bind their trade, confine their manufactures, and exercise every power whatsoever, except that of taking their money out of their pockets without their consent.

[On February 26, 1766, a bill was introduced repealing the Stamp Act; but a Declaratory Act was introduced, asserting the authority of the

king and Parliament to make laws which should "bind the colonies and people of America *in all cases whatsoever!*" Lord Camden said of the Declaratory Act when in the House of Lords: "My position is this—I repeat it—I will maintain it to the last hour: Taxation and representation are inseparable. This position is founded on the laws of nature. It is more; it is in itself an eternal law of nature. For whatever is a man's own is absolutely his own. No man has a right to take it from him without his consent, either expressed by himself or his representative. Whoever attempts to do this attempts an injury; whoever does it commits a robbery. He throws down and destroys the distinction between liberty and slavery." The Stamp Act was afterwards repealed, but the Declaratory Act was passed.]

ON A MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS TO THE THRONE.*

I rise, my Lords, to declare my sentiments on this most solemn and serious subject. It has imposed a load upon my mind, which, I fear, nothing can remove, but which impels me to endeavour its alleviation, by a free and unreserved communication of my sentiments.

In the first part of the address, I have the honour of heartily concurring with the noble earl who moved it. No man feels sincerer joy than I do; none can offer more genuine congratulations on every accession of strength to the Protestant succession. I therefore join in every congratulation on the birth of another princess, and the happy recovery of her Majesty.

But I must stop here. My courtly complacence will carry me no further. I will not join in congratulation on misfortune and disgrace. I cannot concur in a blind and servile address, which approves, and endeavours to sanctify the monstrous measures which have heaped disgrace and misfortune upon us. This, my Lords, is a perilous and tremendous moment. It is not a time for adulation. The smoothness of flattery cannot now avail—cannot save us in this rugged and awful crisis. It is now necessary to instruct the Throne in the language of truth. We must dispel the illusion and the darkness which envelop it, and display, in its full danger and true colours, the ruin that is brought to our doors.

This, my Lords, is our duty. It is the proper function of this noble assembly, sitting, as we do, upon our honours in this House, the hereditary council of the Crown. *Who* is the minister —*where* is the minister, that has dared to suggest to the Throne the contrary, unconstitutional language this day delivered from it? The accustomed language from the Throne has been application to Parliament for advice, and a reliance on its constitutional advice and assistance. As it is the right of Parliament to give, so it is the duty of the Crown to ask it. But on this day, and in this extreme momentous exigency, no reliance is reposed on our constitutional counsels! no advice is asked from the sober and enlightened care of Parliament! but the Crown, from itself and by itself, declares an unalterable determination to pursue measures—and what measures, my Lords? The measures that have produced the imminent perils that threaten us; the measures that have brought ruin to our doors.

Can the minister of the day now presume to expect a continuance of support in this ruinous infatuation? Can Parliament be so dead to its dignity and its duty as to be thus deluded into the loss of the one and the violation of the other? To give an unlimited credit and support for the steady perseverance in measures not proposed for our parliamentary advice, but dictated and forced upon us—in measures, I say, my Lords, which have reduced this late flourishing empire to ruin and contempt! "But yesterday, and England might have stood against the world; now none so poor to do her reverence."* I use the words of a poet; but, though it be poetry, it is no fiction. It is a shameful truth, that not only the power and strength of this country are wasting away and expiring, but her well-earned glories, her true honour, and substantial dignity are sacrificed.

France, my Lords, has insulted you; she has encouraged and sustained America; and, whether America be wrong or right, the dignity of this country ought to spurn at the officious insult of French interference. The ministers and ambassadors of those who are called rebels and enemies are in Paris; in Paris they transact the reciprocal interests of America and France. Can there be a more mortifying insult? Can even our ministers sustain a more humiliating disgrace? Do they dare to resent it? Do they presume even to hint a vindication of their honour, and the dignity of the state, by requiring the dismission of the plenipotentiaries of America? Such is the degradation to which they have reduced the glories of England. The people whom they affect to call contemptible rebels, but whose growing power has at last obtained the name of enemies; the people with whom they have engaged this country in war, and against whom they now command our implicit support in every measure of desperate hostility—this people, despised as rebels, or acknowledged as enemies, are abetted against

* A speech at the opening of Parliament, delivered in the House of Lords, November 18, 1777. This speech is said to have been corrected by Lord Chatham himself.

* "But yesterday the word of Cæsar might
Have stood against the world; now lies he there,
And none so poor to do him reverence."
—*Julius Cæsar*, Act III., Sc. 6

you, supplied with every military store, their interests consulted, and their ambassadors entertained, by your inveterate enemy! and our ministers dare not interpose with dignity or effect. Is this the honour of a great kingdom? Is this the indignant spirit of England, who "but yesterday" gave law to the house of Bourbon? My Lords, the dignity of nations demands a decisive conduct in a situation like this. Even when the greatest prince that perhaps this country ever saw filled our throne, the requisition of a Spanish general, on a similar subject, was attended to, and complied with; for, on the spirited remonstrance of the Duke of Alva, Elizabeth found herself obliged to deny the Flemish exiles all countenance, support, or even entrance into her dominions; and the Count Le Marque, with his few desperate followers, were expelled the kingdom. Happening to arrive at the Brille, and finding it weak in defence, they made themselves masters of the place; and this was the foundation of the United Provinces.

My Lords, this ruinous and ignominious situation, where we cannot act with success nor suffer with honour, calls upon us to remonstrate in the strongest and loudest language of truth, to rescue the ear of majesty from the delusions which surround it. The desperate state of our arms abroad is in part known. No man thinks more highly of them than I do. I love and honour the English troops. I know their virtues and their valour. I know they can achieve anything except impossibilities; and I know that the conquest of English America *is an impossibility*. You cannot, I venture to say it, *you cannot* conquer America. Your armies last war effected everything that could be effected, and what was it? It cost a numerous army, under the command of a most able general [Lord Amherst], now a noble lord in this House, a long and laborious campaign to expel five thousand Frenchmen from French America. My Lords, *you cannot conquer America*. What is your present situation there? We do not know the worst; but we know that in three campaigns we have done nothing and suffered much. Besides the sufferings, perhaps *total loss*, of the Northern force,* the best appointed army that ever took the field, commanded by Sir William Howe, has retired from the American lines. *He was obliged* to relinquish his attempt, and, with great delay and danger, to adopt a new and distant plan of operations. We shall soon know, and in any event have reason to lament, what may have happened since. As to conquest, therefore, my Lords, I repeat it is impossible. You may swell every expense and every effort still more extravagantly; pile and accumulate every assistance you can buy or borrow; traffic and barter with every little pitiful German prince that sells and sends his subjects to the shambles of a foreign prince, your efforts are for ever vain and impotent—doubly so from this mercenary aid on which you rely, for it irritates, to an incurable resentment, the minds of your enemies, to overrun them with the mercenary sons of rapine and plunder, devoting them and their possessions to the rapacity of hireling cruelty. If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country, I never would lay down my arms—never—never—never!

Your own army is infected with the contagion of these illiberal allies. The spirit of plunder and of rapine is gone forth among them. I know it; and, notwithstanding what the noble earl [Lord Percy] who moved the address has given as his opinion of the American army, I know from authentic information, and the *most experienced officers*, that our discipline is deeply wounded. While this is notoriously our sinking situation, America grows and flourishes; while our strength and discipline are lowered, hers are rising and improving.

But, my Lords, who is the man that, in addition to these disgraces and mischiefs of our army, has dared to authorise and associate to our arms the tomahawk and scalping-knife of the savage? to call into civilised alliance the wild and inhuman savage of the woods—to delegate to the merciless Indian the defence of disputed rights, and to wage the horrors of his barbarous war against our brethren? My Lords, these enormities cry aloud for redress and punishment. Unless thoroughly done away, it will be a stain on the national character. It is a violation of the Constitution. I believe it is against law. It is not the least of our national misfortunes that the strength and character of our army are thus impaired. Infected with the mercenary spirit of robbery and rapine, familiarised to the horrid scenes of savage cruelty, it can no longer boast of the noble and generous principles which dignify a soldier—no longer sympathise with the dignity of the royal banner, nor feel the pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war, "that make ambition virtue!" What makes ambition virtue? The sense of honour. But is the sense of honour consistent with a spirit of plunder, or the practice of murder? Can it flow from mercenary motives, or can it prompt to cruel deeds? Besides these murderers and plunderers, let me ask our ministers, What other allies have they acquired? What *other powers* have they associated to their cause? Have they entered into alliance with the *king of the gipsies*? Nothing, my Lords, is too low or too ludicrous to be consistent with their counsels.

The independent views of America have been stated and asserted as the foundation of this address. My Lords, no man wishes for the due dependence of America on this country more than I do. To preserve it, and not confirm that state of independence into which *your measures* hitherto have *driven them*, is the object which

* General Burgoyne's army.

we ought to unite in attaining. The Americans, contending for their rights against arbitrary exactions, I love and admire. It is the struggle of free and virtuous patriots. But, contending for independency and total disconnection from England, as an Englishman, I cannot wish them success; for in a due constitutional dependency, including the ancient supremacy of this country in regulating their commerce and navigation, consists the mutual happiness and prosperity both of England and America. She derived assistance and protection from us, and we reaped from her the most important advantages. She was, indeed, the fountain of our wealth, the nerve of our strength, the nursery and basis of our naval power. It is our duty, therefore, my Lords, if we wish to save our country, most seriously to endeavour the recovery of these most beneficial subjects, and in this perilous crisis perhaps the present moment may be the only one in which we can hope for success. For in their negotiations with France they have, or think they have, reason to complain, though it be notorious that they have received from that power important supplies and assistance of various kinds, yet it is certain they expected it in a more decisive and immediate degree. America is in ill humour with France; on some points they have not entirely answered her expectations. Let us wisely take advantage of every possible moment of reconciliation. Besides, the natural disposition of America herself still leans toward England—to the old habits of connection and mutual interest that united both countries. This *was* the established sentiment of all the Continent; and still, my Lords, in the great and principal part—the sound part of America—this wise and affectionate disposition prevails. And there is a very considerable part of America yet sound—the middle and the southern provinces. Some parts may be factious and blind to their true interests; but if we express a wise and benevolent disposition to communicate with them those immutable rights of nature and those constitutional liberties to which they are equally entitled with ourselves, by a conduct so just and humane we shall confirm the favourable and conciliate the adverse. I say, my Lords, the rights and liberties to which they are equally entitled with ourselves, *but no more.* I would participate to them every enjoyment and freedom which the colonising subjects of a free state can possess, or wish to possess; and I do not see why they should not enjoy every fundamental right in their property, and every original substantial liberty which Devonshire, or Surrey, or the county I live in, or any other county in England, can claim, reserving always, as the sacred right of the mother country, the due constitutional dependency of the colonies. The inherent supremacy of the State in regulating and protecting the navigation and commerce of all her subjects, is necessary for the mutual benefit and preservation of every part, to constitute and preserve the prosperous arrangement of the whole empire.

The sound parts of America, of which I have spoken, must be sensible of these great truths and of their real interests. America is not in that state of desperate and contemptible rebellion which this country had been deluded to believe. It is not a wild and lawless banditti, who, having nothing to lose, might hope to snatch something from public convulsions. Many of their leaders and great men have a great stake in this great contest. The gentleman who conducts their armies, I am told, has an estate of four or five thousand pounds a year; and when I consider these things, I cannot but lament the inconsiderate violence of our penal acts, our declarations of treason and rebellion, with all the fatal effects of attainder and confiscation.

As to the disposition of foreign powers which is asserted [in the king's speech] to be pacific and friendly, let us judge, my Lords, rather by their actions and the nature of things than by interested assertions. The uniform assistance supplied to America by France suggests a different conclusion. The most important interests of France in aggrandising and enriching herself with what she most wants, supplies of every naval store from America, must inspire her with different sentiments. The extraordinary preparations of the house of Bourbon, by land and by sea, from Dunkirk to the Straits, equally ready and willing to overwhelm these defenceless islands, should rouse us to a sense of their real disposition and our own danger. Not five thousand troops in England! hardly three thousand in Ireland! What can we oppose to the combined force of our enemies? Scarcely twenty ships of the line so fully or sufficiently manned that any admiral's reputation would permit him to take the command of! The river of Lisbon in the possession of our enemies! The seas swept by American privateers! Our Channel trade torn to pieces by them! In this complicated crisis of danger, weakness at home and calamity abroad, terrified and insulted by the neighbouring powers, unable to act in America, or acting only to be destroyed, where is the man with the forehead to promise or hope for success in such a situation, or from perseverance in the measures that have driven us to it? Who has the forehead to do so? Where is that man? I should be glad to see his face.

You cannot *conciliate* America by your present measures. You cannot *subdue* her by your present or by any measures. What, then, can you do? You cannot conquer; you cannot gain; but you can *address;* you can lull the fears and anxieties of the moment into an ignorance of the danger that should produce them. But, my Lords, the time demands the language of truth. We must not now apply the flattering unction of servile compliance or blind complacence. In a just and necessary war, to

maintain the rights or honour of my country, I would strip the shirt from my back to support it. But in such a war as this, unjust in its principle, impracticable in its means, and ruinous in its consequences, I would not contribute a single effort nor a single shilling. I do not call for vengeance on the heads of those who have been guilty; I only recommend to them to make their retreat. Let them walk off; and let them make haste, or they may be assured that speedy and condign punishment will overtake them.

My Lords, I have submitted to you, with the freedom and truth which I think my duty, my sentiments on your present awful situation. I have laid before you the ruin of your power, the disgrace of your reputation, the pollution of your discipline, the contamination of your morals, the complication of calamities, foreign and domestic, that overwhelm your sinking country. Your dearest interests, your own liberties, the Constitution itself, totters to the foundation. All this disgraceful danger, this multitude of misery, is the monstrous offspring of this unnatural war. We have been deceived and deluded too long. Let us now stop short. This is the crisis, the only crisis of time and situation, to give us a possibility of escape from the fatal effects of our delusions. But if, in an obstinate and infatuated perseverance in folly, we slavishly echo the peremptory words this day presented to us, nothing can save this devoted country from complete and final ruin. We madly rush into multiplied miseries and "confusion worse confounded."

Is it possible, can it be believed, that ministers are yet blind to this impending destruction? I did hope, that instead of this false and empty vanity, this overweening pride, engendering high conceits and presumptuous imaginations, ministers would have humbled themselves in their errors, would have confessed and retracted them, and by an active, though a late repentance, have endeavoured to redeem them. But, my Lords, since they had neither sagacity to foresee, nor justice nor humanity to shun these oppressive calamities—since not even severe experience can make them feel, nor the imminent ruin of their country awaken them from their stupefaction, the guardian care of Parliament must interpose. I shall therefore, my Lords, propose to you an amendment of the address to his Majesty, to be inserted immediately after the two first paragraphs of congratulation on the birth of a princess, to recommend an immediate cessation of hostilities, and the commencement of a treaty to restore peace and liberty to America, strength and happiness to England, security and permanent prosperity to both countries. This, my Lords, is yet in our power; and let not the wisdom and justice of your Lordships neglect the happy, and perhaps the only opportunity. By the establishment of irrevocable law, founded on mutual rights, and ascertained by treaty, these glorious enjoyments may be firmly perpetuated. And let me repeat to your Lordships, that the strong bias of America, at least of the wise and sounder parts of it, naturally inclines to this happy and constitutional reconnection with you. Notwithstanding the temporary intrigues with France, we may still be assured of their ancient and confirmed partiality to us. America and France cannot be congenial. There is something decisive and confirmed in the honest American, that will not assimilate to the futility and levity of Frenchmen.

My Lords, to encourage and confirm that innate inclination to this country, founded on every principle of affection, as well as consideration of interest; to restore that favourable disposition into a permanent and powerful reunion with this country; to revive the mutual strength of the empire; again to awe the house of Bourbon, instead of meanly truckling, as our present calamities compel us, to every insult of French caprice and Spanish punctilio; to re-establish our commerce; to reassert our rights and our honour; to confirm our interests, and renew our glories for ever—a consummation most devoutly to be endeavoured, and which, I trust, may yet arise from reconciliation with America—I have the honour of submitting to you the following amendment, which I move to be inserted after the two first paragraphs of the address:

"And that this House does most humbly advise and supplicate his Majesty to be pleased to cause the most speedy and effectual measures to be taken for restoring peace in America; and that no time may be lost in proposing an immediate cessation of hostilities there, in order to the opening of a treaty for the final settlement of the tranquillity of these invaluable provinces, by a removal of the unhappy causes of this ruinous civil war, and by a just and adequate security against the return of the like calamities in times to come. And this House desire to offer the most dutiful assurances to his Majesty, that they will, in due time, cheerfully co-operate with the magnanimity and tender goodness of his Majesty for the preservation of his people, by such explicit and most solemn declarations, and provisions of fundamental and irrevocable laws, as may be judged necessary for the ascertaining and fixing for ever the respective rights of Great Britain and her colonies."

[Lord Suffolk, in the course of this debate, in alluding to the employment of Indians in the war, said "it was perfectly justifiable to use all the means that *God and nature put into our hands!*"]

I am astonished (exclaimed Lord Chatham, as he rose), shocked! to hear such principles confessed—to hear them avowed in this House, or in this country; principles equally unconstitutional, inhuman, and unchristian!

My Lords, I did not intend to have encroached

again upon your attention, but I cannot repress my indignation. I feel myself impelled by every duty. My Lords, we are called upon as members of this House, as men—as Christian men—to protest against such notions standing near the Throne, polluting the ear of Majesty. "That God and nature put into our hands!" I know not what ideas that lord may entertain of God and nature, but I know that such abominable principles are equally abhorrent to religion and humanity. What! to attribute the sacred sanction of God and nature to the massacres of the Indian scalping-knife—to the cannibal savage torturing, murdering, roasting, and eating—literally, my Lords, *eating* the mangled victims of his barbarous battles! Such horrible notions shock every precept of religion, divine or natural, and every generous feeling of humanity. And, my Lords, they shock every sentiment of honour; they shock me as a lover of honourable war, and a detester of murderous barbarity.

These abominable principles, and this more abominable avowal of them, demand the most decisive indignation. I call upon that right reverend bench—those holy ministers of the Gospel, and pious pastors of our Church—I conjure them to join in the holy work, and vindicate the religion of their God. I appeal to the wisdom and the law of this learned bench, to defend and support the justice of their country. I call upon the bishops to interpose the unsullied sanctity of their lawn; upon the learned judges to interpose the purity of their ermine, to save us from this pollution. I call upon the honour of your Lordships to reverence the dignity of your ancestors, and to maintain your own. I call upon the spirit and humanity of my country to vindicate the national character. I invoke the genius of the Constitution. From the tapestry that adorns these walls, the immortal ancestor of this noble lord frowns with indignation at the disgrace of his country.* In vain he led your victorious fleets against the boasted Armada of Spain; in vain he defended and established the honour, the liberties, the religion—the *Protestant religion*—of this country, against the arbitrary cruelties of popery and the Inquisition, if these more than popish cruelties and inquisitorial practices are let loose among us—to turn forth into our settlements, among our ancient connections, friends, and relations, the merciless cannibal, thirsting for the blood of man, woman, and child; to send forth the infidel savage—against whom? Against your Protestant brethren; to lay waste their country, to desolate their dwellings, and extirpate their race and name with these horrible hell-hounds of savage war—*hell-hounds, I say, of savage war!* Spain armed herself with blood-hounds to extirpate the wretched natives of America, and we improve on the inhuman example even of Spanish cruelty; we turn loose these savage hell-hounds against our brethren and countrymen in America, of the same language, laws, liberties, and religion, endeared to us by every tie that should sanctify humanity.

My Lords, this awful subject, so important to our honour, our Constitution, and our religion, demands the most solemn and effectual inquiry. And I again call upon your Lordships, and the united powers of the state, to examine it thoroughly and decisively, and to stamp upon it an indelible stigma of the public abhorrence. And I again implore those holy prelates of our religion to do away these iniquities from among us. Let them perform a lustration; let them purify this House, and this country, from this sin.

My Lords, I am old and weak, and at present unable to say more; but my feelings and indignation were too strong to have said less. I could not have slept this night in my bed, nor reposed my head on my pillow, without giving this vent to my eternal abhorrence of such preposterous and enormous principles.

[The amendment was rejected by a vote of 97 to 24.]

* In allusion to a representation on the tapestry of the House of Lords of the English fleet led by the ship of the lord admiral, Effingham Howard (ancestor of Suffolk), to engage the Spanish Armada.

LAURENCE STERNE.

1713-1768.

THE HOUSE OF FEASTING AND THE HOUSE OF MOURNING DESCRIBED.*

THAT I deny; but let us hear the wise man's reasoning upon it—"For that *is* the end of all men, and the living *will* lay it to *his* heart; sorrow is better than laughter"—for a crack-brained order of Carthusian monks, I grant, but not for men of the world. For what purpose, do you imagine, has God made us? for the social sweets of the well-watered valleys, where he has planted us; or for the dry and dismal desert of a Sierra Morena? Are the sad accidents of life, and the uncheery hours which perpetually overtake us—are they not enough, but we must sally forth in quest of them, belie our own hearts, and say, as our text would have us, that they are better than those of joy. Did the Best of Beings send us into the world for this end—to go weeping through it—to vex and shorten a life short and vexatious enough already? Do you think, my good preacher, that He who is infinitely happy can envy us our enjoyments? or that a Being so infinitely kind would grudge a mournful traveller the short rest and refreshments necessary to support his spirits through the stages of a weary pilgrimage? or that He would call him to a severe reckoning, because in his way he had hastily snatched at some little fugacious pleasures, merely to sweeten this uneasy journey of life, and reconcile him to the ruggedness of the road, and the many hard jostlings he is sure to meet with? Consider, I beseech you, what provision and accommodation the Author of our being has prepared for us, that we might not go on our way sorrowing; how many caravanseras of rest; what powers and faculties He has given us for taking it; what apt objects He has placed in our way to entertain us—some of which He has made so fair, so exquisitely fitted for this end, that they have power over us for a time, to charm away the sense of pain, to cheer up the dejected heart under poverty and sickness, and make it go and remember its miseries no more.

I will not contend at present against this rhetoric; I would choose rather for a moment to go on with the allegory, and say we are travellers, and, in the most affecting sense of that idea, that, like travellers, though upon business of the last and nearest concern to us, we may surely be allowed to amuse ourselves with the natural or artificial beauties of the country we are passing through, without reproach of forgetting the main errand we are sent upon; and if we can so order it as not to be led out of the way by the variety of prospects, edifices, and ruins which solicit us, it would be a nonsensical piece of saint-errantry to shut our eyes.

But let us not lose sight of the argument in pursuit of the simile.

Let us remember, various as our excursions are, that we have still set our faces towards Jerusalem; that we have a place of rest and happiness, towards which we hasten, and that the way to get there is not so much to please our hearts, as to improve them in virtue; that mirth and feasting are usually no friends to achievements of this kind, but that a season of affliction is in some sort a season of piety, not only because our sufferings are apt to put us in mind of our sins, but that by the check and interruption which they give to our pursuits, they allow us what the hurry and bustle of the world too often deny us—and that is a little time for reflection, which is all that most of us want to make us wiser and better men; that at certain times it is so necessary a man's mind should be turned towards itself, that, rather than want occasions, he had better purchase them at the expense of his present happiness He had better, as the text expresses it, *go to the house of mourning*, where he will meet with something to subdue his passions, than to the house of feasting, where the joy and gaiety of the place is likely to excite them. That whereas the entertainments and caresses of the one place expose his heart and lay it open to temptations; the sorrows of the other defend it, and as naturally shut them from it. So strange and unaccountable a creature is man; he is so framed that he cannot but pursue happiness; and yet, unless he is made sometimes miserable, how apt is he to mistake the way which can only lead him to the accomplishment of his own wishes.

This is the full force of the wise man's declaration. But to do further justice to his words, I will endeavour to bring the subject still nearer. For which purpose it will be necessary to stop here, and take a transient view of the two places here referred to—the house of mourning, and the house of feasting. Give me leave, therefore, I beseech you, to recall both of them for a moment to your imaginations, that thence I may appeal to your hearts, how faithfully, and upon what good grounds, the effects and natural operations of each upon our minds are intimated in the text.

And first, let us look into the house of feasting.

And here, to be as fair and candid as possible

* "It is better to go to the house of mourning than to the house of feasting" (Eccles. vii. 2, 3).

in the description of this, we will not take it from the worst originals, such as are open merely for the sale of virtue, and so calculated for the end, that the disguise each is under not only gives power safely to drive on the bargain, but safely to carry it into execution too.

This we will not suppose to be the case; nor let us even imagine the house of feasting to be such a scene of intemperance and excess as the house of feasting does often exhibit; but let us take it from one as little exceptionable as we can—where there is, or at least appears, nothing really criminal, but where everything seems to be kept within the visible bounds of moderation and sobriety.

Imagine, then, such a house of feasting, where, either by consent or invitation, a number of each sex is drawn together for no other purpose but the enjoyment and mutual entertainment of each other, which we will suppose shall arise from no other pleasures but what custom authorises, and religion does not absolutely forbid.

Before we enter, let us examine what must be the sentiments of each individual previous to his arrival, and we shall find, however they may differ from one another in tempers and opinions, that every one seems to agree in this, that, as he is going to a house dedicated to joy and mirth, it was fit he should divest himself of whatever was likely to contradict that intention, or be inconsistent with it. That for this purpose he had left his cares, his serious thoughts, and his moral reflections, behind him; and was come forth from home with only such dispositions and gaiety of heart as suited the occasion, and promoted the intended mirth and jollity of the place. With this preparation of mind, which is as little as can be supposed, since it will amount to no more than a desire in each to render himself an acceptable guest, let us conceive them entering into the house of feasting, with hearts set loose from grave restraints, and open to the expectations of receiving pleasure. It is not necessary, as I premised, to bring intemperance into this scene, or to suppose such an excess in the gratification of the appetites as shall ferment the blood and set the desires in a flame. Let us admit no more of it, therefore, than will gently stir them, and fit them for the impressions which so benevolent a commerce will naturally excite. In this disposition, thus wrought upon beforehand, and already improved to this purpose, take notice how mechanically the thoughts and spirits rise; how soon and insensibly they are got above the pitch and first bounds which cooler hours would have marked.

When the gay and smiling aspect of things has begun to leave the passages to a man's heart thus thoughtlessly unguarded; when kind and caressing looks of every object without, that can flatter his senses, have conspired with the enemy within to betray him, and put him off his defence; when music likewise hath lent her aid, and tried her power upon the passions; when the voice of singing men, and the voice of singing women, with the sound of the viol and the lute, have broken in upon his soul, and in some tender notes have touched the secret springs of rapture, that moment let us dissect and look into his heart—see how vain! how weak! how empty a thing it is! Look through its several recesses, those pure mansions formed for the reception of innocence and virtue: sad spectacle! Behold those fair inhabitants now dispossessed—turned out of their sacred dwellings, to make room—for what? At the best, for levity and indiscretion; perhaps for folly; it may be for more impure guests, which possibly, in so general a riot of the mind and senses, may take occasion to enter unsuspected at the same time.

In a scene and disposition thus described, can the most cautious say, Thus far shall my desires go, and no further? or will the coolest and most circumspect say, when pleasure has taken full possession of his heart, that no thought nor purpose shall arise there which he would have concealed? In those loose and unguarded moments, the imagination is not always at command; in spite of reason and reflection, it will forcibly carry him sometimes whither he would not—like the unclean spirit, in the parent's sad description of his child's case, which took him, and ofttimes cast him into the fire to destroy him; and wheresoever it taketh him it teareth him, and hardly departeth from him.

But this, you'll say, is the worst account of what the mind may suffer here.

Why may we not make more favourable suppositions? that numbers, by exercise and custom to such encounters, learn gradually to despise and triumph over them; that the minds of many are not so susceptible of warm impressions, or so badly fortified against them, that pleasure should easily corrupt or soften them; that it would be hard to suppose, of the great multitudes which daily throng and press into this house of feasting, but that numbers come out of it again with all the innocence with which they entered; and that if both sexes are included in the computation, what *fair* example shall we see of many of so pure and chaste a turn of mind that the house of feasting, with all its charms and temptations, was never able to excite a thought or awaken an inclination which virtue need to blush at, or which the most scrupulous conscience might not support. God forbid we should say otherwise. No doubt, numbers of all ages escape unhurt, and get off this dangerous sea without shipwreck. Yet are they not to be reckoned amongst the more fortunate adventurers? and though one would not absolutely prohibit the attempt, or be so cynical as to condemn every one who tries it, since there are so many, I suppose, who cannot well do otherwise, and whose condition and situation

in life unavoidably force them upon it, yet we may be allowed to describe this fair and flattering coast, we may point out the unsuspected dangers of it, and warn the unwary passenger where they lie. We may show him what hazards his youth and inexperience will run, how little he can gain by the venture, and how much wiser and better it would be (as is implied in the text) to seek occasions rather to improve his little stock of virtue than incautiously expose it to so unequal a chance, where the best he can hope is to return safe with what treasure he carried out, but where probably he may be so unfortunate as to lose it all, be lost himself, and undone for ever.

Thus much for the house of feasting; which, by the way, though generally open at other times of the year throughout the world, is supposed, in Christian countries, now everywhere to be universally shut up. And, in truth, I have been more full in my cautions against it, not only as reason requires, but in reverence to this season,* wherein our Church exacts a more particular forbearance and self-denial in this point, and thereby adds to the restraints upon pleasure and entertainments which this representation of things has suggested against them already.

Here, then, let us turn aside from this gay scene; and suffer me to take you with me for a moment to one much fitter for your meditation. Let us go into the house of mourning, made so by such afflictions as have been brought in merely by the common cross accidents and disasters to which our condition is exposed—where, perhaps, the aged parents sit broken-hearted, pierced to their souls with the folly and indiscretion of a thankless child—the child of their prayers, in whom all their hopes and expectations centred: perhaps a more affecting scene—a virtuous family lying pinched with want, where the unfortunate support of it, having long struggled with a train of misfortunes, and bravely fought up against them, is now piteously borne down at the last, overwhelmed with a cruel blow which no forecast or frugality could have prevented. O God! look upon his afflictions. Behold him distracted with many sorrows, surrounded with the tender pledges of his love and the partner of his cares, without bread to give them, unable, from the remembrance of better days, to dig; to beg, ashamed.

When we enter into the house of mourning such as this, it is impossible to insult the unfortunate, even with an improper look. Under whatever levity and dissipation of heart such objects catch our eyes, they catch likewise our attentions, collect and call home our scattered thoughts, and exercise them with wisdom. A transient scene of distress, such as is here sketched, how soon does it furnish materials to set the mind at work; how necessarily does it engage it to the consideration of the miseries and misfortunes, the dangers and calamities to which the life of man is subject. By holding up such a glass before it, it forces the mind to see and reflect upon the vanity—the perishing condition and uncertain tenure of everything in this world. From reflections of this serious cast, how insensibly do the thoughts carry us further; and from considering what we are, what kind of world we live in, and what evils befall us in it, how naturally do they set us to look forwards at what possibly we shall be; for what kind of world we are intended; what evils may befall us there; and what provision we should make against them here, whilst we have time and opportunity.

If these lessons are so inseparable from the house of mourning here supposed, we shall find it a still more instructive school of wisdom when we take a view of the place in that more affecting light in which the wise man seems to confine it in the text, in which, by the house of mourning, I believe he means that particular scene of sorrow where there is lamentation and mourning for the dead.

Turn in hither, I beseech you, for a moment. Behold a dead man ready to be carried out, the only son of his mother, and she a widow. Perhaps a more affecting spectacle—a kind and indulgent father of a numerous family lies breathless—snatched away in the strength of his age—torn in an evil hour from his children and the bosom of a disconsolate wife.

Behold much people of the city gathered together to mix their tears, with settled sorrow in their looks, going heavily along to the house of mourning, to perform that last melancholy office which, when the debt of nature is paid, we are called upon to pay to each other.

If this sad occasion, which leads him there, has not done it already, take notice to what a serious and devout frame of mind every man is reduced, the moment he enters this gate of affliction. The busy and fluttering spirits which in the house of mirth were wont to transport him from one diverting object to another—see how they are fallen; how peaceably they are laid. In this gloomy mansion, full of shades and uncomfortable damps to seize the soul—see the light and easy heart which never knew what it was to think before, how pensive it is now, how soft, how susceptible, how full of religious impressions, how deeply it is smitten with sense and with a love of virtue. Could we, in this crisis, whilst this empire of reason and religion lasts, and the heart is thus exercised with wisdom, and busied with heavenly contemplations—could we see it naked as it is—stripped of its passions, unspotted by the world, and regardless of its pleasures—we might then safely rest our cause upon this single evidence, and appeal to the most sensual, whether Solomon has not made a just determination here, in favour of the

* Preached in *Lent*.

house of mourning; not for its own sake, but as it is fruitful in virtue, and becomes the occasion of so much good. Without this end, sorrow, I own, has no use but to shorten a man's days; nor can gravity, with all its studied solemnity of look and carriage, serve any end but to make one-half of the world merry, and impose upon the other.

Consider what has been said, and may God, of His mercy, bless you! Amen.

GEORGE WHITEFIELD.

1714-1770.

THE WISE AND FOOLISH VIRGINS.*

THE apostle to the Hebrews informs us that "it is appointed for all men once to die; after that," says he, "cometh the judgment." And I think, if any consideration be sufficient to awaken a sleeping drowsy world, it must be this: that there will be a day wherein these heavens shall be wrapt up like a scroll—the elements melt with fervent heat—this earth, and all the things therein, be burnt up—and every soul of every nation summoned to appear before the dreadful tribunal of the righteous Judge of quick and dead, to receive rewards or punishments according to the deeds done in their bodies.

The great apostle of the Gentiles, when brought before Felix, could think of no better means to convert that sinful man than to reason of temperance, righteousness, and, more especially, of a judgment to come. The first might, in some measure affect, but I am persuaded it was the last consideration—I mean that of a judgment to come—that made him tremble. And so bad as the world is grown, yet there are few have their consciences seared with a red-hot iron, so as to deny that there will be a reckoning hereafter. The promiscuous dispensations of Providence in this life, wherein we see good men afflicted, destitute, tormented, and the wicked permitted triumphantly to ride over their heads, has been always looked upon as an indisputable argument by the generality of mankind, that there will be a day in which God will judge the world in righteousness, and administer true judgment unto his people. Some, indeed, are so bold as to deny it, whilst they are engaged in the pursuit of the lust of the eye and the pride of life; but follow them to their death-beds—ask them, when their souls are ready to launch into eternity, what they then think of a judgment to come, and they will tell you they dare not give their consciences the lie any longer. They feel a fearful looking-for of judgment, and fiery indignation, in their hearts.

Since, then, these things are so, does it not highly concern each of us, my brethren, before we come on a bed of sickness, seriously to examine how the account stands between God and our souls, and how it will fare with us in that day? As for the openly profane, the drunkard, the whoremonger, the adulterer, and such like, there is no doubt what will become of them; without repentance they shall never enter into the kingdom of God and His Christ. No, their damnation slumbereth not; a burning fiery Tophet, kindled by the fury of God's eternal wrath, is prepared for their reception, wherein they must suffer the vengeance of an eternal fire. Nor is there the least doubt of the state of true believers; for though they be despised and rejected of natural men, yet, being born again of God, and joint-heirs with Christ, they have the earnest of the promised inheritance in their hearts; they are assured that a new and living way is made open for them by the blood of Jesus Christ, through which an abundant entrance into the kingdom of heaven shall be administered to them at the great day of account. The only question is, what will become of the almost Christian?—one that is content to go, as he thinks, in the easy middle way to heaven, without being profane on the one hand, or, as he now falsely imagines, righteous overmuch on the other. Multitudes there are in every congregation, and consequently here present, of this stamp. And, what is worst of all, it is easier to convince the most notorious publicans and sinners of their being out of a state of salvation, than any of these almost Christians. And if Jesus Christ may be our Judge, they shall as certainly be rejected and disowned by Him at the last day, as though they lived in an open defiance of all His laws.

For what says our Lord in the parable of which my text is a conclusion, and which I intend to make the subject of my present discourse? "Then" (that is, at the day of judgment, which He had been discoursing of in the foregoing chapter, and prosecutes in this) "shall the kingdom of heaven" (that is, the state of Christians in general) "be likened unto ten virgins, which took their lamps, and went forth to meet the Bridegroom." In which words there is a

* "Watch therefore; for ye know neither the day nor the hour in which the Son of man cometh" (Matt. xxv. 13).

manifest allusion to a custom prevailing in our Lord's time among the Jews at marriage solemnities, which, being generally in the night, it was customary for the persons of the bride-chamber to go out in procession, with many lights, to meet the bridegroom. By the Bridegroom here you are to understand Jesus Christ. The Church—that is, true believers—are His spouse. He is united to them by one spirit, even in this life; but the solemnising of these sacred nuptials is reserved till the day of judgment, when He shall come to take them home to Himself, and present them, before men and angels, as His purchase, to His Father, without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing. By the ten virgins, we are to understand the professors of Christianity in general. All are called virgins, because all are called to be saints. All who name the name of Christ are obliged, by that very profession, to depart from all iniquity. The pure and chaste in heart are the only persons that will be so blessed as to see God. As Christ was born of a virgin's womb, so Christ can dwell in none but virgin souls—souls made pure and holy by the indwelling of His Holy Spirit. But what says the apostle? "All are not Israelites that are of Israel." All are not true Christians that are called after the name of Christ. "Five of these virgins were wise"—that is, true believers—"and five were foolish"—that is, formal hypocrites, whited sepulchres, mere outside professors. But why are five said to be wise, and the other five foolish? Hear what our Lord says in the following verses: "They that were foolish took their lamps, and took no oil with them; but the wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps." "They that were foolish took their lamps;" that is, the lamps of an outward profession; they would go to church, say over several manuals of prayers, come perhaps even into a field to hear a sermon, give at collections, and receive the sacrament constantly, nay, oftener than once a month. But then here lay the mistake; they had no oil in their lamps—no principle of grace, no living faith in their hearts; without which, though we should give all our goods to feed the poor, and our bodies to be burned, it would profit us nothing. In short, they were exact, nay, perhaps, superstitiously bigoted to the form, but all the while they were strangers to, and, in effect, denied the power of godliness in their hearts. They would go to church, but, at the same time, think it no harm to go to a ball or an assembly, notwithstanding they promised at their baptism to renounce the pomps and vanities of this wicked world. They were so exceeding fearful of being righteous over-much, that they would even persecute those that were truly devout, if they attempted to go a step further than themselves. In one word, they never effectually felt the powers of the world to come; they thought they might be Christians without anything of inward feelings; and, therefore, notwithstanding their high pretensions, they had only a name to live.

And now, sirs, let me pause a while, and, in the name of that God whom I endeavour to serve in the Gospel of His dear Son, give me leave to ask you one question. Whilst I have been drawing, though in miniature, the character of those foolish virgins, have not many of your consciences made the application, and with a small, still, though articulate voice, said, Thou man, thou woman, art one of those foolish virgins, for thy sentiments and practice agree thereto? Do not then stifle, but encourage these convictions, and who knows but that the Lord, who is rich in mercy to all that call upon Him faithfully, may so work upon you, even by this foolishness of preaching, as to make you wise virgins before you return home!

What they were you shall know immediately: "But the wise," says our Lord (verse 4), "took oil in their vessels with their lamps." Observe, "the wise"—that is, the true believers—had their lamps as well as the foolish virgins; for Christianity does not require us to cast off outward forms; we may use forms, and yet not be formal. For instance, it is possible to worship God in a set form of prayer, and yet worship Him in spirit and in truth; and therefore, brethren, let us not judge one another. The wise virgins had their lamps. Herein then did not lie the difference between them, that the one worshipped with a form, and the other did not; no, as the Pharisee and Publican went up to the temple to pray, so these wise and foolish virgins might go to the same place of worship, and sit under the same minister; but then the wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps. They kept up the form, but did not rest in it. Their words in prayer were the language of their hearts, and they were no strangers to inward feelings; they had savingly tasted the good word of life, and felt, or had an experimental knowledge of the powers of the world to come; they were not afraid of searching doctrine, nor affronted when ministers told them they by nature deserved to be damned; they were not self-righteous, but willing that Jesus Christ should have all the glory of their salvation: they were convinced that the merits of Jesus Christ were to be apprehended only by faith; but yet they were as careful to maintain good works, as though they were to be justified by them. In short their obedience flowed from love and gratitude, and was cheerful, constant, uniform, and universal, like unto that obedience which the holy angels pay our Father in heaven.

Here, then, let me exhort you to pause again; and, if any of you can faithfully apply these characters to your hearts, give God the glory, and take the comfort to your own souls. You are not false, but true believers. Jesus Christ has been made of God to you wisdom, even that

wisdom whereby you shall be made wise unto salvation. God sees a difference between you and foolish virgins, if natural men will not. You need not therefore be uneasy, if a like state of misery and mortality happen to you both; I say, a like state of misery and mortality; for (verse 5) "while the Bridegroom tarried," that is, in the space of time which passeth between our Lord's ascension, and His coming again to judgment, "they all slumbered and slept." The wise as well as the foolish died; for dust we all are, and to dust we must return. It is no reflection at all upon the Divine goodness, that believers, as well as hypocrites, must pass through the valley of the shadow of death; for Christ has taken away the sting out of it, so that we need fear no evil. It is to them a passage to everlasting life. Death is only terrible to those that have no hope, because they live without faith, and therefore without God in the world. Whosoever there are amongst you that have received the first fruits of the Spirit, I am persuaded you are ready to cry out with holy Job, "We would not live here always; we long to be dissolved, that we may be with Jesus Christ; and though worms will destroy our bodies as well as others, yet we are content, being assured that our Redeemer liveth, that He will stand at the latter days upon the earth, and that in our flesh we shall see God." But it is not so with hypocrites and unbelievers beyond the grave. For what says our Lord?

"And at midnight." Observe, at midnight, when all was hushed and quiet, and no one dreaming of any such thing, a cry was made; the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God was heard, sounding this general alarm to things in heaven, to things in earth, and to things in the waters under the earth. *Behold*, mark how this awful summons is ushered in with the word *behold*, to engage our attention—"Behold the Bridegroom," even Jesus Christ, the Desire of nations, the Bridegroom of His spouse the Church: because He tarried for a while, to exercise the faith of saints, and give sinners space to repent, scoffers were apt to cry out, "Where is the promise of His coming?" But He is not slack concerning His promise, as these men account slackness; for, "Behold, He that was to come is now come, and will not tarry any longer. He cometh to be glorified with His saints, and to take vengeance on them that know not God, and have not obeyed His Gospel." He cometh, not as a poor despised Galilean; not to be stabled in a stinking manger; not to be despised and rejected of men; not to be blindfolded, spit upon, and buffeted; not to be nailed to an accursed tree; not as the Son of Man, but, as He really was, the eternal Son of God. He cometh riding on the wings of the wind, in the glory of the Father and His holy angels, and to be had in everlasting reverence of all that shall be round about Him. "Go ye forth to meet Him." Arise, ye dead, ye foolish as well as wise virgins, arise and come to judgment. Multitudes, no doubt, that hear this awakening cry, would rejoice if "the rocks might fall on them, and the hills cover them from the presence of the Lamb." What would they give, if, as they lived like beasts, they might now die like them that perish? How would they rejoice, if those same excuses, which they had made on this side eternity, for attending on holy ordinances, would now keep them from appearing before the heavenly Bridegroom? But as Adam, notwithstanding his fig leaves, and the trees of the garden, could not hide himself from God, when arrested with an "Adam, where art thou?" so now the decree is gone forth, and the trump of God has given its last sound; all tongues, people, nations, and languages, both wise and foolish virgins, must come into His presence, and bow beneath His footstool. Even Pontius Pilate, Annas and Caiaphas, even the proud persecuting high priests and Pharisees of this generation, must now appear before Him.

For, says our Lord, then—that is, when the cry was made, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh"—in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, the graves were opened, the sea gave up its dead, and all those virgins, both wise and foolish, arose and trimmed their lamps; that is, endeavoured to put themselves in a posture to meet the Bridegroom.

But how may we imagine the foolish virgins were surprised, when, notwithstanding their high thoughts, and proud imaginations of their security, they now find themselves wholly naked, and void of that inward holiness and purity of heart, without which no man living, at that day, shall comfortably meet the Lord! I doubt not but many of these foolish virgins, whilst in this world, were clothed in purple and fine linen, fared sumptuously every day, and would disdain to set many of the wise virgins, some of which might be as poor as Lazarus, even with the dogs of their flock. Those were looked upon by them as enthusiasts and madmen, as persons that were righteous overmuch, and who intended to turn the world upside down; but now death hath opened their eyes, and convinced them, to their eternal sorrow, that he is not a true Christian who is only one outwardly. Now they find, though alas! too late, that they, and not the wise virgins, had been beside themselves. Now their proud hearts are made to stoop, their lofty looks are brought low; and, as Dives entreated that Lazarus might dip the tip of his finger in water, and be sent to cool his tongue, so these foolish virgins, these formal hypocrites, are obliged to turn beggars to those whom they once despised. "Give us of your oil." Oh, impart to us a little of that grace and Holy Spirit, for your insisting on which we fools accounted your lives madness, for alas! "our lamps are gone out;" we had only the form of godliness;

we were whited sepulchres; we were heart-hypocrites; we contented ourselves with desiring to be good; and, though confident of salvation whilst we lived, yet our hope is entirely gone now; God has taken away our souls. Give us, therefore, oh, give us, though we once despised you, give us of your oil, for our lamps of an outward profession are quite gone out.

"Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, saith the Lord, with this." My brethren in Christ, hear what the foolish say to the wise virgins, and learn in patience to possess your souls. If you are true followers of the lowly Jesus, I am persuaded you have your names cast out, and all manner of evil spoken against you falsely for His name's sake. For no one ever did, or will live godly in Christ Jesus, without suffering persecution; nay, I doubt not but your chief foes are those of your own households. Tell me, do not your carnal relations and friends vex your tender souls, day by day, in bidding you spare yourselves, and take heed lest you go too far? And, as you passed along to come and hear the word of God, have you not heard many a Pharisee cry out, Here comes another troop of His followers? Brethren, be not surprised; Christ's servants were always the world's fools. "You know it hated Him, before it hated you. Rejoice and be exceeding glad; yet a little while, and behold the Bridegroom cometh;" and then shall you hear these formal scoffing Pharisees saying unto you, "Give us of your oil, for our lamps are gone out." When you are reviled, revile not again; when you suffer, threaten not, but commit your souls into the hands of Him that judgeth righteously; for behold the day cometh when the children of God shall speak for themselves.

The wise virgins in the parable, no doubt, endured the same cruel mockings as you may do; but, as the lamb before the shearer is dumb, so in this life opened they not their mouth: but now we find they can give their enemies an answer: "Not so, lest there be not enough for us and you; but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves." These words are not to be understood as though they were spoken in an insulting manner, for true charity teaches us to use the worst of sinners, and our most bitter enemies, with the meekness and gentleness of Christ. Though Dives was in hell, yet Abraham does not say, "Thou villain," but only, "Son, remember." And I am persuaded, had it been in the power of these wise virgins, they would have dealt with the foolish virgins (as God knows I would willingly deal with my most inveterate enemies): not only give them of their oil, but also exalt them to the right hand of God. It was not, then, for want of love, but for fear of wanting a sufficiency for themselves, that made them return this answer, "Not so, lest there be not enough for us and you." For they that have most grace have none to spare. None but self-righteous, foolish virgins think they are good enough. Those who are truly wise, are always most distrustful of themselves, pressing forward to the things that are before, and think it well if, after they have done all, being yet but unprofitable servants, they can make their calling and election sure. "Not so, lest there be not enough for us and you; but go rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves." These words, indeed, seem to be spoken with a kind of triumph, though certainly in the most compassionate manner: "Go ye to them that sell, and buy for yourselves." Unhappy virgins! you accounted our lives folly, whilst with you in the body. How often have you condemned us for our zeal in running to hear the Word, and looked upon us as enthusiasts for talking about, and affirming, that we must be led by the Spirit, and walk by the Spirit and hear the Spirit of God witnessing with our spirits that we are His children? But now you would be glad to be partakers of this privilege; it is not ours to give; you have been sleeping, when you should have been striving to enter in at the strait gate, "and now go to them that sell [if you can], and buy for yourselves."

And what say you to this, ye foolish formal professors? (for I doubt not but curiosity, and the desire of novelty, hath brought many such to this despised place to hear a sermon.) Can you hear this reply to the foolish virgins, and yet not tremble? Why, yet a little while, and thus it shall be said to you. Rejoice and bolster yourselves up in your duties and forms; endeavour to cover your nakedness with the fig leaves of an outward profession and a legal righteousness, and despise the true servants of Christ as much as you please, yet know that all your hopes will fail you when God brings you into judgment. For not he who commends himself is justified, but whom the Lord commendeth.

But to return. We do not hear any reply the foolish virgins make; no, their consciences condemned them; they are struck dumb, and are now filled with anxious thoughts how they shall buy oil, that they may lift up their heads before the Bridegroom.

"But whilst they go to buy"—that is, whilst they are thinking what they shall do—the Bridegroom, the Lord Jesus, the Head, the King, the Husband of His spouse the Church, cometh attended with thousands, and twenty times ten thousands of saints and angels, publicly to count up His jewels; and they are ready, the wise virgins, who have oil in their lamps, and are sealed by His Spirit to the day of redemption; these having on the wedding garment of His righteousness, the covering of His Holy Spirit, go in with Him to the marriage. But who can express the transports that these wise virgins feel while they are thus admitted in a holy triumph into the presence and full enjoyment of Him whom their souls hungered and thirsted after?

No doubt they had tasted of His love, and, by faith, had often fed on Him in their hearts when sitting down to commemorate His last supper here on earth. But how full may we think their hearts and tongues are of His praises, now they are sitting down together to eat bread in His heavenly kingdom? And what is still an addition to their happiness, the door is now shut, that so they may enjoy the ever-blessed God and the company of angels, and the spirits of just men made perfect, without interruption. I say without interruption; for in this life their eyes often gushed out with water because men kept not God's law, and they could never come to appear before the Lord, or to hear His Word, but Satan, and his servants and children, would come also to disturb them. But now the door is shut. Now there is a perfect communion of saints, which they in vain longed for in this lower world. Now tares no longer grow up with the wheat. Not one single hypocrite or unbeliever can screen himself amongst them. Now "the wicked cease from troubling," now their weary souls enjoy an everlasting rest.

Once more, O believers, let me exhort you in patience to possess your souls. God, if He has freely justified you by faith in His Son, and given you His Spirit, has sealed you to be His, and has secured you as surely as He secured Noah when He locked him in the ark. For a little while, 'tis true, though heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ, and neither men nor devils can pluck you out of your Heavenly Father's hands, yet you must be tossed about with manifold temptations. But lift up your heads, the day of your perfect and complete redemption draweth nigh. Behold the Bridegroom cometh to take you to Himself; the door shall be shut, and you shall be for ever with the Lord.

But I even tremble to tell you, O nominal Christians! that the door will be shut—I mean the door of mercy—never to be opened to give you admission, though you should continue knocking to all eternity. For thus speaks our Lord (verse 11): "Afterwards"—that is, after those that were ready had gone in, and the door was shut, after these foolish virgins had, to their sorrow, found that no oil was to be bought, no grace to be procured—"came also the other virgins," and as Esau, after Jacob had got the blessing, cried with an exceeding bitter cry, "Bless me, even me also, O my father," so they come saying, "Lord, Lord, open unto us."

Observe the importunity of these foolish virgins, implied in these words, "Lord, Lord." Whilst in the body, I suppose, they only read, but did not pray over their prayers. If you would tell them they should pray without ceasing, they should pray with their hearts, and feel the want of what they prayed for, they would answer, they could not tell what you meant by inward feelings; that God did not require us to be always on our knees; but if a man did justly, and loved mercy, and did as the Church forms required him, it was as much as the Lord required at his hands.

I fear, sirs, too many amongst us are of this mind; nay, I fear there are many so profanely polite, and void of the love of God, as to think it too great a piece of self-denial, to rise early to offer up a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. If any such, by the good providence of God, are brought hither this morning, I beseech you consider your ways, and remember, if you are not awakened out of your spiritual lethargy, and live a life of prayer here, you shall in vain cry out with the foolish virgins, "Lord, Lord, open unto us" hereafter.

Observe, further, the impudence, as well as importunity, of those other virgins. "Lord, Lord," say they, as though they were intimately acquainted with the holy Jesus. Like numbers amongst us, who, because they go to church, repeat their creeds, and perhaps receive the sacrament, think they have a right to call Jesus their Saviour, and dare call God their Father, when they put up the Lord's Prayer. But Jesus is not your Saviour; the devil, not God, is your father, unless your hearts are purified by faith, and you are born again from above. It is not the being baptized by water only, but by the Holy Ghost also, that must purify and perfect your fallen nature. And it will do you no service at the great day, to say unto Christ, "Lord, my name is in the register of such or such a parish," unless the laws and image of Christ are written and stamped upon your hearts. I am persuaded the foolish virgins could say this, and more. But what answer did the blessed Jesus make? He answered and said (verse 12): "Verily, I say unto you"—He puts the word "verily" to assure them that He was in earnest—"I say unto you," I who am truth itself, I whom you have owned in words, but in works denied, "Verily I say unto you I know you not." These words must not be understood literally; for whatever Arians and Socinians may vainly say to the contrary, yet we affirm that Jesus Christ is God, God blessed for ever, and therefore knoweth all things. He saw Nathanael, when under the fig-tree. He sees, and is now looking down from Heaven, His dwelling-place, upon us, to see how we behave in these fields. Brethren, I know nothing of the thoughts and intents of your hearts in coming hither, but Jesus Christ does. He knows who come like new-born babes, desirous to be fed with the sincere milk of the Word; and He knows who come to hear what the babbler says, and to run away with part of a broken sentence, that they may have whereof they may ridicule or accuse him. This expression, then, "I know you not," must not be understood literally. No; it only denies a knowledge of approbation; as though Christ

had said, "You call me Lord, Lord, but ye have not done the things that I have said: you desire me to open the door, but how can you come in hither, not having on a wedding-garment? Alas! you are naked as you came into the world. Where is my outward righteousness imputed to you? Where is my inherent righteousness wrought in you? Where is my divine image stamped upon your souls? How dare you call me Lord, Lord, when you have not received the Holy Ghost, whereby I seal all that are truly mine? Verily I know you not. Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."

And now, "he that hath ears to hear let him hear" what manner of persons these were whom Jesus Christ dismissed with this answer.

Remember, I entreat you remember, they are not sent away for being fornicators, swearers, Sabbath-breakers, or prodigals; no, in all probability, as I observed before, they were, touching the outward observances of the moral law, blameless; they were zealous maintainers of the form of religion; and if they did no good, yet no one could say they did any one any harm. That for which they were condemned, and eternally banished from the presence of the Lord (for so much is implied in that sentence, "I know you not"), was this: they had no oil in their lamps, no principle of eternal life, or true and living faith, and love of God in their hearts. But, alas! if persons may go to church, receive the sacraments, lead honest moral lives, and yet be sent to hell at the last day, as they certainly will if they advance no further, where wilt thou, O drunkard? where wilt thou, O swearer? where wilt thou, O Sabbath-breaker? where wilt thou that deniest divine revelation, and even the form of godliness?—where wilt thou and such like sinners appear?

I know very well where you must appear, even before the dreadful tribunal of Jesus Christ. For, however you may, like Felix, continually put off your convictions, yet you, as well as others, must arise after death, and appear in judgment. You will then find, to your eternal sorrow, what I just hinted at in the beginning of this discourse, viz., that your damnation slumbereth not. Sin has blinded your hearts, and hardened your foreheads now. But yet a little while and our Lord will avenge Him of His adversaries. Already, by faith, I see the heavens opened, and the holy Jesus coming, with His face brighter than ten thousand suns, and darting fury upon you from His eyes. I see you rising from your graves, trembling and astonished, and crying out, Who can abide this day of His coming? And now what inference shall I draw from what has been delivered? Our Lord, in the words of the text, hath drawn one for me: "Watch, therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh."

"Watch"—that is, be upon your guard, and keep your graces in continual exercise; for as, when we are commanded to watch unto prayer, it signifies that we should continue instant in that duty; so, when we are required to watch in general, it means that we should put on the whole armour of God, and live every day as though it was our last.

And O that the Lord may now enable me to lift up my voice like a trumpet! For had I a thousand tongues, or could I speak so loud that the whole world might hear me, I could not sound a more useful alarm than that which is contained in the words of the text. Watch, therefore, my brethren, I beseech you by the mercies of God in Christ Jesus, watch—be upon your guard. "Awake, ye that sleep in the dust; for ye know not the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh." Perhaps to-day, perhaps this next midnight, the cry may be made. For in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, the trump is to sound. However, supposing the final day of judgment to all may yet be a great way off, yet to us it is certainly near at hand. For what is our life? It is but a vapour—it is but a span long; so soon it passeth away, and we are gone. Blessed be God, we are all here well; but who, out of this great multitude, dare say, I shall go home to my house in safety? Who knows but, whilst I am speaking, God may commission His ministering spirits immediately to call some of you off by a sudden stroke, to give an account with what attention, and to what intent, you have heard this sermon? And it is chiefly for this reason that God has hid the day of our death from us. For, since I know not but I may die to-morrow, why, O my soul (may each of us say), wilt thou not watch to-day? Since I know not but I may die the next moment, why wilt thou not prepare for dying this?

You know, my brethren, some such instances have lately been given us. And what angel or spirit hath assured us that some of you shall not be the next? "Watch, therefore; for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh."

Many such reflections as these, my brethren, crowd in upon my mind. At present, blessed be the Lord, who delights to magnify His strength in a poor worm's weakness, I am at a stand, not so much about what I shall say as what I shall leave unsaid. My belly, like Elihu's, is, as it were, full of new wine; out of the abundance of my heart my mouth speaketh. The seeing so great a multitude standing before me—a sense of the infinite majesty of that God in whose name I preach, and before whom I, as well as you, must appear to give an account—and the uncertainty there is whether I shall live another day to speak to you any more—these considerations, I say, especially the presence of God, which I now feel in my soul, furnish me with so much matter that I scarce know how to

begin, and where to end my application. However, by the Divine assistance, I will address myself more particularly to three sorts of persons.

And first, I would remind you that you are notoriously ungodly in the land, of what our Lord says in the text. For, though I have said that your damnation slumbereth not, whilst you continue in an impenitent state, yet that was only to set you upon your watch, to convince you of your danger, and excite you to cry out, What shall we do to be saved? I appeal to all that hear me, whether I have said, the door of mercy shall be shut against you, if you believe in Jesus Christ. No, if you are the chief of sinners, if you are the murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, if you are the dung and offscouring of all things; yet if you believe on Jesus Christ, and continue to cry unto Him with the faith of the penitent thief, "Lord, remember us, now thou art in Thy kingdom," I will pawn my eternal salvation upon it, if He does not shortly translate you to His heavenly paradise. Wonder not at my speaking with so much assurance, for I know "this is a faithful and true saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save all believing sinners;" nay, so great is His love, that I am persuaded, were it necessary, He would come again into the world, and die a second time for them on the cross. But, blessed be God, when our Lord bowed down His head, and gave up the ghost, our redemption was finished. It is not our sins, but our want of a lively faith in His blood, that will prove our condemnation. If you draw near to Him now by faith, though you are the worst of sinners, yet He will not say unto you, "Verily, I know you not." No, a door of mercy shall be opened to you. Look then, look by an eye of faith to that God-Man whom you have pierced. Behold Him bleeding, panting, dying upon the cross, with arms stretched out, ready to embrace you all. Hark how He groans. See how all nature is in an agony. The rocks rend, the graves open, the sun withdraws its light, ashamed, as it were, to see the Saviour suffer. And all this to proclaim man's great redemption. Nay, the holy Jesus, in the most bitter agonies and pangs of death, prays for His very murderers: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." What, then, if you have crucified the Son of God afresh, and put Him to open shame, yet do not despair—only believe, and even this shall be forgiven you. You have read, at least you have heard, no doubt, how three thousand were converted at St Peter's preaching one single sermon after our Lord's ascension into heaven; and many of the crucifiers of the Lord of glory undoubtedly were amongst them. And why should you despair? for Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. The Holy Ghost shall be sent down on you as well as on them, if you do but believe. For Christ ascended up on high to receive this gift, even for the vilest of men—for His greatest enemies. Come, then, all ye that are weary and heavy-laden with a sense of your sins, lay hold on Christ by faith, and He shall give you rest. For salvation is the free gift of God to all them that believe. And though you may think this too good news to be true, yet I speak the truth in Christ, I lie not; this is the Gospel, this is the glad tidings which we are commissioned to preach to every creature. Be not faithless, then, but believing. Let not the devil lead you captive at his will any longer; for all the wages he gives his servants is death—death often in this life—death always—everlasting death in the next. But now the free gift of God is eternal life to all that believe in Jesus Christ. Pharisees are, and will be offended at my coming here, and offering your salvation on such cheap terms. But the more they bid me hold my peace, the more will I cry out, and proclaim to sinners, that Jesus the Son of David as He was man, but David's Lord as He was God, "will have mercy upon all that by a living faith truly turn to Him." If to preach this is to be vile, I pray God I may be more vile. If they will not let me preach Christ crucified, and offer salvation to poor sinners in a church, I will preach Him in the lanes, streets, highways, and hedges; and nothing pleases me better than to think I am now in one of the devil's strongest holds. Surely the Lord has not sent me and all you hither for nothing; no, blessed be God, "the fields are white, ready unto harvest," and many souls, I hope, will be gathered into His heavenly garner. It is true, it is the midnight of the Church, especially the poor Church of England; but God has lately sent forth His servants to cry, "Behold, the Bridegroom cometh." I beseech you, O sinners, hearken unto the voice; let me espouse you now by faith to my dear Master, and henceforward watch and pray, that you may be ready to go forth to meet Him.

Secondly, I would apply myself to those amongst you that are not openly profane, but, by depending on a formal round of duties, deceive your own souls, and are still as the foolish virgins.

But I must speak to your conviction before I can speak to your comfort. My brethren, do not deceive your own souls. You have heard how far the foolish virgins went, and yet were answered with a "Verily, I know you not." The reason is, because none but such as have a living faith in Jesus Christ, and are truly born again from above, can possibly enter into the kingdom of heaven. You may, perhaps, live honestly, and outwardly moral lives; but if you depend on that morality, or join your works with your faith, in order to justify you before God, you have no lot or share in Christ's redemption. For what is this but to deny the Lord that has bought you? What is this but

making yourselves your own saviours—taking the crown from Jesus Christ, and putting it on your own heads? The crime of the devil, some have supposed, consisted in this, that he would not bow to the name of Jesus, when He came into the world as man, when the Father commanded all the angels to worship Him. And what do you less? You will not own and submit to His righteousness. And though you pretend to worship Him with your lips, yet your hearts are far from Him. Besides, you, in effect, deny the operations of His blessed Spirit; you mistake common for effectual grace. You hope to be saved, because you have good desires. What is this, but to give God, His Word, and all His saints the lie? A Jew, a Turk, has equally as good grounds whereon to build his hopes of salvation. Great need, therefore, have I to cry out to you, O foolish virgins, watch; beg of God to convince you of your self-righteousness, and the secret unbelief of your hearts, or otherwise, whensoever the cry shall be made, "Behold, the Bridegroom cometh," you will find yourselves utterly unprepared to go forth to meet Him. You may cry, "Lord, Lord," but the answer will be, "Verily, I know you not."

Thirdly, I would speak a word or two, by way of exhortation, to those who are wise virgins, and are well assured that they have on a wedding-garment.

That there are many such amongst you, who, by grace, have renounced your own righteousness, and know assuredly that the righteousness of the Lord Jesus is imputed to you, I make no doubt. God has His secret ones in the worst of times; and I am persuaded He has not let so loud a Gospel cry be made amongst His people for nothing. No, I am confident the Holy Ghost has been given to some on the preaching of faith; nay, has powerfully fallen upon many, whilst they have been hearing the Word. You are now then no longer foolish, but wise virgins; notwithstanding, I beseech you also, suffer the word of exhortation; for wise virgins are too apt, whilst the Bridegroom tarries, to slumber and sleep: watch, therefore, my dear brethren, watch and pray, at this time especially, for perhaps a time of suffering is at hand. The ark of the Lord begins already to be driven into the wilderness. Be ye therefore upon the watch, and still persevere in following your Lord even without the camp, bearing His reproach. The cry that has been lately made, has awakened the devil and his servants—they begin to rage horribly; and well they may, for I hope their kingdom is in danger. Watch, therefore, my brethren; for if we are not always upon our guard, a time of trial may overtake us unawares, and instead of owning, like Peter, we may be tempted to deny our Master. Set death and eternity often before you. Look unto Jesus, the author and finisher of your faith, and consider how little a while it will be ere He comes to judgment, and then our reproach shall be wiped away; the accusers of us and our brethren shall be cast down, and the door being shut, we all shall continue for ever in heaven with our dear Lord Jesus. Amen! and Amen!

Lastly, What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch. High and low, rich and poor, young and old, one with another, of whatever sect or denomination, for I regard not that, I beseech you, by the mercies of that Jesus whom I am now preaching, be upon your guard. Flee, flee to Jesus Christ, that heavenly Bridegroom; behold, He desires to take you to Himself. Miserable, poor, blind, and naked, as you are, yet He is willing to clothe you with His everlasting righteousness, and make you partakers of that glory which He enjoyed with the Father before the world was. Oh, do not turn a deaf ear to me; do not reject the message on account of the meanness of the messenger! I am a child, a youth of uncircumcised lips, but the Lord has chosen me, that the glory might be all His own. Had He sent to invite you by a learned rabbi, you might have been tempted to think the man had done something. But now God has sent a child that cannot speak, that the excellency of the power may be seen to be not of man, but of God. Let letter-learned Pharisees, then, despise my youth: I care not how vile I appear in the sight of such men, I glory in it; and I am persuaded, if any of you should be set upon your watch by this preaching, you will have no reason to repent that God sent a child to cry, "Behold, the Bridegroom cometh!" O my brethren, the thought of being instrumental in bringing some of you to glory, fills me with fresh zeal. Once more, therefore, I entreat you, "Watch, watch and pray;" for the Lord Jesus will receive all that call upon Him, yea, all that call upon Him faithfully. Let that cry, "Behold, the Bridegroom cometh," be continually sounding in your ears; and begin now to live, as though you were assured this was the night in which you were to be summoned to go forth to meet Him. I could say more, but the other business and duties of the day oblige me to stop. May the Lord give you all a hearing ear, and an obedient heart, and so closely unite you to Himself by one spirit, that, when He shall come in terrible majesty to judge mankind, you may be found having on a wedding-garment, and ready to go in with Him to the marriage.

Grant this, O Father, for Thy dear Son's sake, Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen! and Amen!

HUGH BLAIR.

1718-1800.

ON GENTLENESS.*

To be wise in our own eyes, to be wise in the opinion of the world, and to be wise in the sight of God, are three things so very different, as rarely to coincide. One may often be wise in his own eyes, who is far from being so in the judgment of the world; and to be reputed a prudent man by the world is no security for being accounted wise by God. As there is a worldly happiness, which God perceives to be no other than disguised misery · as there are worldly honours, which, in His estimation, are reproach; so there is a worldly wisdom, which in His sight is foolishness. Of this worldly wisdom the characters are given in the context, and placed in contrast with those of the wisdom which is from above. The one is the wisdom of the crafty, the other that of the upright. The one terminates in selfishness, the other in charity. The one is full of strife and bitter envyings, the other of mercy and of good fruits. One of the chief characters by which the wisdom from above is distinguished is gentleness, of which I am now to discourse. Of this there is the greater occasion to discourse, because it is too seldom viewed in a religious light, and is more readily considered by the bulk of men as a mere felicity of nature, or an exterior accomplishment of manners, than as a Christian virtue, which they are bound to cultivate. I shall first explain the nature of this virtue, and shall then offer some arguments to recommend, and some directions to facilitate, the practice of it.

I begin with distinguishing true gentleness from passive tameness of spirit, and from unlimited compliance with the manners of others. That passive tameness which submits without struggle to every encroachment of the violent and assuming forms no part of Christian duty; but, on the contrary, is destructive of general happiness and order. That unlimited complacence which, on every occasion, falls in with the opinions and manners of others, is so far from being a virtue that it is itself a vice, and the parent of many vices. It overthrows all steadiness of principle, and produces that sinful conformity with the world which taints the whole character. In the present corrupted state of human manners, always to assent and to comply is the very worst maxim we can adopt. It is impossible to support the purity and dignity of Christian morals without opposing the world on various occasions, even though we should stand alone. That gentleness, therefore, which belongs to virtue, is to be carefully distinguished from the mean spirit of cowards and the fawning assent of sycophants. It renounces no just right from fear. It gives up no important truth from flattery. It is indeed not only consistent with a firm mind, but it necessarily requires a manly spirit and a fixed principle, in order to give it any real value. Upon this solid ground only the polish of gentleness can with advantage be superinduced.

It stands opposed not to the most determined regard for virtue and truth, but to harshness and severity, to pride and arrogance, to violence and oppression. It is, properly, that part of the great virtue of charity which makes us unwilling to give pain to any of our brethren. Compassion prompts us to relieve their wants. Forbearance prevents us from retaliating their injuries. Meekness restrains our angry passions; candour, our severe judgments. Gentleness corrects whatever is offensive in our manners; and, by a constant train of humane attentions, studies to alleviate the burden of common misery. Its office, therefore, is extensive. It is not, like some other virtues, called forth only on peculiar emergencies, but it is continually in action when we are engaged in intercourse with men. It ought to form our address, to regulate our speech, and to diffuse itself over our whole behaviour.

I must warn you, however, not to confound this gentle wisdom, which is from above, with that artificial courtesy, that studied smoothness of manners, which is learned in the school of the world. Such accomplishments the most frivolous and empty may possess. Too often they are employed by the artful as a snare, too often affected by the hard and unfeeling as a cover to the baseness of their minds. We cannot, at the same time, avoid observing the homage which, even in such instances, the world is constrained to pay to virtue. In order to render society agreeable, it is found necessary to assume somewhat, that may at least carry its appearance. Virtue is the universal charm. Even its shadow is courted when the substance is wanting. The imitation of its form has been reduced into an art; and, in the commerce of life, the first study of all who would either gain the esteem or win the hearts of others is to learn the speech and to adopt the manners of candour, gentleness, and humanity. But that gentleness which is the characteristic of a good man has, like every other virtue, its seat in the heart: and, let me add, nothing, except what flows from the heart,

* "The wisdom that is from above is gentle" (James iii. 17).

can render even external manners truly pleasing. For no assumed behaviour can at all times hide the real character. In that unaffected civility which springs from a gentle mind, there is a charm infinitely more powerful than in all the studied manners of the most finished courtier.

True gentleness is founded on a sense of what we owe to Him who made us, and to the common nature of which we all share. It arises from reflection on our own failings and wants, and from just views of the condition and the duty of man. It is native feeling, heightened and improved by principle. It is the heart which easily relents, which feels for everything that is human, and is backward and slow to inflict the least wound. It is affable in its address, and mild in its demeanour; ever ready to oblige, and willing to be obliged by others; breathing habitual kindness towards friends, courtesy to strangers, long-suffering to enemies. It exercises authority with moderation, administers reproof with tenderness, confers favours with ease and modesty. It is unassuming in opinion, and temperate in zeal. It contends not eagerly about trifles; slow to contradict, and still slower to blame; but prompt to allay dissension and to restore peace. It neither intermeddles unnecessarily with the affairs, nor pries inquisitively into the secrets of others. It delights above all things to alleviate distress, and if it cannot dry up the falling tear, to soothe at least the grieving heart. Where it has not the power of being useful, it is never burdensome. It seeks to please rather than to shine and dazzle, and conceals with care that superiority, either of talents or of rank, which is oppressive to those who are beneath it. In a word, it is that spirit and that tenor of manners which the Gospel of Christ enjoins, when it commands us to bear one another's burdens; to rejoice with those who rejoice, and to weep with those who weep; to please every one his neighbour for his good, to be kind and tender-hearted, to be pitiful and courteous, to support the weak, and to be patient towards all men.

Having now sufficiently explained the nature of this amiable virtue, I proceed to recommend it to your practice. Let me, for this end, desire you to consider the duty which you owe to God; to consider the relation which you bear to one another; to consider your own interest.

I. Consider the duty which you owe to God. When you survey His works, nothing is so conspicuous, as His greatness and majesty. When you consult His Word, nothing is more remarkable, than His attention to soften that greatness, and to place it in the mildest and least oppressive light. He not only characterises Himself as the "God of consolation," but, with condescending gentleness, He particularly accommodates Himself to the situation of the unfortunate. "He dwelleth with the humble and contrite. He hideth not His face when the afflicted cry. He healeth the broken in heart, and bindeth up their wounds." When His Son came to be the Saviour of the world, He was eminent for the same attribute of mild and gentle goodness. Long before His birth, it was prophesied of Him, that He should "not strive, nor cry, nor cause His voice to be heard in the streets; that the bruised reed He should not break, nor quench the smoking flax" (Matt. xii. 19, 20). And after His death, this distinguishing feature in His character was so universally remembered, that the Apostle Paul, on occasion of a request which he makes to the Corinthians, uses those remarkable expressions, "I beseech you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ" (2 Cor. x. 1). During all His intercourse with men, no harshness, or pride, or stately distance, appeared in His demeanour. In His access, He was easy; in His manner, simple; in His answers mild; in His whole behaviour, humble and obliging. "Learn of me," said He, "for I am meek and lowly in heart." As the Son of God is the pattern, so the Holy Ghost is the inspirer of gentleness. His name is the Comforter, the Spirit of grace and peace. His fruits, or operations on the human mind, are "love, meekness, gentleness, and long-suffering" (Gal. v. 22). Thus, by every discovery of the Godhead, honour is put upon gentleness: it is held up to our view, as peculiarly connected with celestial nature. And suitable to such discoveries, is the whole strain of the Gospel. It were unnecessary to appeal to any single precept. You need only open the New Testament, to find this virtue perpetually inculcated. Charity, or love, is the capital figure ever presented to our view; and gentleness, forbearance, and forgiveness, are the sounds ever recurring on our ear.

So predominant, indeed, is this spirit throughout the Christian dispensation, that even the vices and corruptions of men have not been able altogether to defeat its tendency. Though that dispensation is far from having hitherto produced its full effect upon the world, yet we can clearly trace its influence in humanising the manners of men. Remarkable, in this respect, is the victory which it has gained over those powers of violence and cruelty, which belong to the infernal kingdom. Wherever Christianity prevails, it has discouraged, and, in some degree, abolished slavery. It has rescued human nature from that ignominious yoke, under which, in former ages, the one-half of mankind groaned. It has introduced more equality between the two sexes, and rendered the conjugal union more rational and happy. It has abated the ferociousness of war. It has mitigated the rigour of despotism, mitigated the cruelty of punishments; in a word, it has reduced mankind, from their ancient barbarity, into a more humane and gentle state. Do we pretend respect and zeal for this religion, and at the same time allow ourselves in that harshness and severity, which are so con-

tradictory to its genius? Too plainly we show that it has no power over our hearts. We may retain the Christian name; but we have abandoned the Christian spirit.

II. Consider the relation which you bear to one another. Man, as a solitary individual, is a very wretched being. As long as he stands detached from his kind, he is possessed neither of happiness nor of strength. We are formed by Nature to unite; we are impelled towards each other by the compassionate instincts in our frame; we are linked by a thousand connections, founded on common wants. Gentleness, therefore, or, as it is very properly termed, humanity, is what man, as such, in every station, owes to man. To be inaccessible, contemptuous, and hard of heart, is to revolt against our own nature; is, in the language of Scripture, to "hide ourselves from our own flesh." Accordingly, as all feel the claim which they have to mildness and humanity, so all are sensibly hurt by the want of it in others. On no side are we more vulnerable. No complaint is more feelingly made, than that of the harsh and rugged manners of persons with whom we have intercourse. But how seldom do we transfer the case to ourselves, or examine how far we are guilty of inflicting on others, whose sensibility is the same with ours, those very wounds of which we so loudly complain?

But, perhaps, it will be pleaded by some, that this gentleness, on which we now insist, regards only those smaller offices of life, which in their eye are not essential to religion and goodness. Negligent, they confess, of the government of their temper, or the regulation of their behaviour, on slight occasions; they are attentive, as they pretend, to the great duties of beneficence; and ready, whenever the opportunity presents, to perform important services to their fellow-creatures. But let such persons reflect, that the occasions of performing those important good deeds very rarely occur. Perhaps their situation in life, or the nature of their connections, may in a great measure exclude them from such opportunities. Great events give scope for great virtues; but the main tenor of human life is composed of small occurrences. Within the sound of these lie the materials of the happiness of most men; the subjects of their duty, and the trials of their virtue. Virtue must be formed and supported, not by unfrequent acts, but by daily and repeated exertions. In order to its becoming either vigorous or useful, it must be habitually active; not breaking forth occasionally with a transient lustre, like the blaze of the comet; but regular in its returns, like the light of day: not like the aromatic gale, which sometimes feasts the sense; but like the ordinary breeze, which fans the air, and renders it healthful.

Years may pass over our heads, without affording any opportunity for acts of high beneficence or extensive utility. Whereas not a day passes, but, in the common transactions of life, and especially in the intercourse of domestic society, gentleness finds place for promoting the happiness of others, and strengthening in ourselves the habit of virtue. Nay, by seasonable discoveries of a humane spirit, we sometimes contribute more materially to the advancement of happiness, than by actions which are seemingly more important. There are situations, not a few, in human life, where the encouraging reception, the condescending behaviour, and the look of sympathy, bring greater relief to the heart, than the most liberal supplies of bounty. While, on the other side, when the hand of liberality is extended to bestow, the want of gentleness is sufficient to frustrate the intention of the benefit. We sour those whom we meant to oblige; and, by conferring favours with ostentation and harshness, we convert them into injuries. Can any disposition then be held to possess a low place in the scale of virtue, whose influence is so considerable on the happiness of the world?

Gentleness is in truth the great avenue to mutual enjoyment. Amidst the strife of interfering interests, it tempers the violence of contention, and keeps alive the seeds of harmony. It softens animosities, renews endearments, and renders the countenance of man a refreshment to man. Banish gentleness from the earth; suppose the world to be filled with none but harsh and contentious spirits; and what sort of society would remain? The solitude of the desert were preferable to it. The conflict of jarring elements in chaos; the cave, where subterraneous winds contend and roar; the den, where serpents hiss, and beasts of the forest howl, would be the only proper representations of such assemblies of men. "Oh that I had wings like a dove! for then I would fly away, and be at rest. Lo! then I would wander far off, and remain in the wilderness. I would hasten my escape from the windy storm and tempest. For I have seen violence and strife in the city. Mischief and sorrow are in the midst of it. Deceit and guile depart not from the street" (Psalm lv. 6, 7, 8). Strange! that where men have all one common interest, they should so often absurdly concur in defeating it! Has not Nature already provided a sufficient quantity of unavoidable evils for the state of man? As if we did not suffer enough from the storm which beats upon us without, must we conspire also, in those societies where we assemble, to find a retreat from that storm, to harass one another? But if the sense of duty, and of common happiness, be insufficient to recommend the virtue of which we treat, then let me desire you—

III. To consider your own interest. Whatever ends a good man can be supposed to pursue, gentleness will be found to favour them. It prepossesses and wins every heart. It persuades,

when every other argument fails; often disarms the fierce, and melts the stubborn: whereas harshness confirms the opposition it would subdue; and of an indifferent person creates an enemy. He who could overlook an injury committed in the collision of interests will long and severely resent the slights of a contemptuous behaviour. To the man of gentleness, the world is generally disposed to ascribe every other good quality. The higher endowments of the mind we admire at a distance; and when any impropriety of behaviour accompanies them, we admire without love. They are like some of the distant stars, whose beneficial influence reaches not to us. Whereas, of the influence of gentleness, all in some degree partake, and therefore all love it. The man of this character rises in the world without struggle, and flourishes without envy. His misfortunes are universally lamented; and his failings are easily forgiven.

But whatever may be the effect of this virtue on our external condition, its influence on our internal enjoyment is certain and powerful. That inward tranquillity which it promotes is the first requisite to every pleasurable feeling. It is the calm and clear atmosphere, the serenity and sunshine of the mind. When benignity and gentleness reign within, we are always least in hazard of being ruffled from without; every person, and every occurrence, are beheld in the most favourable light. But let some clouds of disgust and ill-humour gather on the mind, and immediately the scene changes; Nature seems transformed, and the appearance of all things is blackened to our view. The gentle mind is like the smooth stream, which reflects every object in its just proportion, and in its fairest colours. The violent spirit, like troubled waters, renders back the images of things distorted and broken; and communicates to them all that disordered motion which arises solely from its own agitation.

Offences must come. As soon may the waves of the sea cease to roll, as provocations to arise from human corruption and frailty. Attacked by great injuries, the man of mild and gentle spirit will feel what human nature feels; and will defend and resent as his duty allows him. But to those slight provocations, and frivolous offences, which are the most frequent causes of disquiet, he is happily superior. Hence his days flow in a far more placid tenor than those of others; exempted from the numberless discomposures which agitate vulgar minds. Inspired with higher sentiments; taught to regard, with indulgent eye, the frailties of men, the omissions of the careless, the follies of the imprudent, and the levity of the fickle, he retreats into the calmness of his spirit, as into an undisturbed sanctuary; and quietly allows the usual current of life to hold its course.

This virtue has another, and still more important connection with our interest, by means of that relation which our present behaviour bears to our eternal state. Heaven is the region of gentleness and friendship: hell, of fierceness and animosity. If then, as the Scripture instructs us, "according to what we now sow, we must hereafter reap," it follows that the cultivation of a gentle temper is necessary to prepare us for future felicity; and that the indulgence of harsh dispositions is the introduction to future misery. Men, I am afraid, too often separate those articles of their belief which relate to eternity from the ordinary affairs of the world. They connect them with the seasons of seriousness and gravity. They leave them, with much respect, as in a high region, to which, only on great occasions, they resort; and, when they descend into common life, consider themselves as at liberty to give free scope to their humours and passions. Whereas, in fact, it is their behaviour in the daily train of social intercourse, which, more than any other cause, fixes and determines their spiritual character; gradually instilling those dispositions, and forming those habits, which affect their everlasting condition. With regard to trifles, perhaps, their malignant dispositions may chiefly be indulged. But let them remember well, that those trifles, by increasing the growth of peevishness and passion, become pregnant with the most serious mischiefs; and may fit them, before they are aware, for being the future companions of infernal spirits only.

I mean not to say, that in order to our preparation for heaven, it is enough to be mild and gentle; or that this virtue alone will cover all our sins. Through the felicity of natural constitution, a certain degree of this benignity may be possessed by some whose hearts are in other respects corrupt, and their lives irregular. But what I mean to assert is, that where no attention is given to the government of temper, meetness for heaven is not yet acquired, and the regenerating power of religion is as yet unknown. One of the first works of the Spirit of God is, to infuse into every heart which it inhabits that "gentle wisdom which is from above." "They who are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts;" but let it not be forgotten, that among the works of the flesh, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, and envyings, are as expressly enumerated, as uncleanness, murders, drunkenness, and revelling. They who continue either in the one or the other, "shall not inherit," indeed cannot inherit, "the kingdom of God."

Having thus shown the importance of gentleness, both as a moral virtue and as a Christian grace, I shall conclude the subject with briefly suggesting some considerations which may be of use to facilitate the practice of it.

For this end, let me advise you to view your character with an impartial eye; and to learn from your own failings to give that indulgence

which in your turn you claim. It is pride which fills the world with so much harshness and severity. In the fulness of self-estimation, we forget what we are. We claim attentions to which we are not entitled. We are rigorous to offences, as if we had never offended; unfeeling to distress, as if we knew not what it was to suffer. From those airy regions of pride and folly, let us descend to our proper level. Let us survey the natural equality on which Providence has placed man with man, and reflect on the infirmities common to all. If the reflection on natural equality and mutual offences be insufficient to prompt humanity, let us at least remember what we are in the sight of God. Have we none of that forbearance to give to one another, which we all so earnestly entreat from Heaven? Can we look for clemency or gentleness from our Judge, when we are so backward to show it to our own brethren?

Accustom yourselves also to reflect on the small moment of those things which are the usual incentives to violence and contention. In the ruffled and angry hour, we view every appearance through a false medium. The most inconsiderable point of interest or honour swells into a momentous object, and the slightest attack seems to threaten immediate ruin. But after passion or pride has subsided, we look round in vain for the mighty mischiefs we dreaded. The fabric which our disturbed imagination had reared totally disappears. But, though the cause of contention has dwindled away, its consequences remain. We have alienated a friend, we have embittered an enemy, we have sown the seeds of future suspicion, malevolence, or disgust. Suspend your violence, I beseech you, for a moment, when causes of discord occur. Anticipate that period of coolness, which of itself will soon arrive. Allow yourselves to think how little you have any prospect of gaining by fierce contention; but how much of the true happiness of life you are certain of throwing away. Easily, and from the smallest chink, the bitter waters of strife are let forth; but their course cannot be foreseen; and he seldom fails of suffering most from their poisonous effect, who first allowed them to flow.

But gentleness will, most of all, be promoted by frequent views of those great objects which our holy religion presents. Let the prospects of immortality fill your minds. Look upon this world as a state of passage. Consider yourselves as engaged in the pursuit of higher interests; as acting now, under the eye of God, an introductory part to a more important scene. Elevated by such sentiments, your mind will become calm and sedate. You will look down, as from a superior station, on the petty disturbances of the world. They are the selfish, the sensual, and the vain, who are most subject to the impotence of passion. They are linked so closely to the world; by so many sides they touch every object, and every person around them, that they are perpetually hurt, and perpetually hurting others. But the spirit of true religion removes us to a proper distance from the grating objects of worldly contention. It leaves us sufficiently connected with the world, for acting our part in it with propriety; but disengages us from it so far as to weaken its power of disturbing our tranquillity. It inspires magnanimity, and magnanimity always breathes gentleness. It leads us to view the follies of men with pity, not with rancour; and to treat, with the mildness of a superior nature, what in little minds would call forth all the bitterness of passion.

Aided by such considerations, let us cultivate that gentle wisdom which is, in so many respects, important both to our duty and our happiness. Let us assume it as the ornament of every age, and of every station. Let it temper the petulance of youth, and soften the moroseness of old age. Let it mitigate authority in those who rule, and promote deference among those who obey. I conclude with repeating the caution, not to mistake for true gentleness that flimsy intimation of it called polished manners, which often among men of the world, under a smooth appearance, conceals much asperity. Let yours be native gentleness of heart, flowing from the love of God, and the love of man. Unite this amiable spirit with a proper zeal for all that is right, and just, and true. Let piety be combined in your character with humanity. Let determined integrity dwell in a mild and gentle breast. A character thus supported will command more real respect than can be procured by the most shining accomplishments when separated from virtue.

JOHN WILKES.*

1727-1797.

ON MOVING FOR LEAVE TO BRING IN A BILL FOR A JUST AND EQUAL REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND IN PARLIAMENT, 1776.

ALL wise Governments and well-regulated states have been particularly careful to mark and correct the various abuses which a considerable length of time almost necessarily creates. Among these, one of the most striking and important in our country is the present unfair and inadequate state of the representation of the people of England in Parliament. It is now become so partial and unequal, from the lapse of time, that I believe almost every gentleman in the House will agree with me in the necessity of its being taken into our most serious consideration, and of our endeavouring to find a remedy for this great and growing evil.

I wish, sir, my slender abilities were equal to a thorough investigation of this momentous business; very diligent and well-meant endeavours have not been wanting to trace it from the first origin. The most natural and perfect idea of a free government is, in my mind, that of the people themselves assembling to determine by what laws they choose to be governed, and to establish the regulations they think necessary for the protection of their property and liberty against all violence and fraud. Every member of such a community would submit with alacrity to the observance of whatever had been enacted by himself, and assist with spirit in giving efficacy and vigour to laws and ordinances which derived all their authority from his own approbation and concurrence. In small inconsiderable states, this mode of legislation has been happily followed, both in ancient and modern times. The extent and populousness of a great empire seems scarcely to admit it without confusion or tumult, and therefore, our ancestors, more wise in this than the ancient Romans, adopted the representation of the many by a few, as answering more fully the true ends of government. Rome was enslaved from inattention to this very circumstance, and by one other fatal act, which ought to be a strong warning to the people, even against their own representatives here—the leaving power too long in the hands of the same persons, by which the armies of the republic became the armies of Sylla, Pompey, and Cæsar. When all the burghers of Italy obtained the freedom of Rome, and voted in public assemblies, their multitudes rendered the distinction of the citizen of Rome, and the alien, impossible. Their assemblies and deliberations became disorderly and tumultuous. Unprincipled and ambitious men found out the secret of turning them to the ruin of the Roman liberty and the commonwealth. Among us this evil is avoided by representation, and yet the justice of this principle is preserved. Every Englishman is supposed to be present in Parliament, either in person or by deputy chosen by himself; and therefore the resolution of Parliament is taken to be the resolution of every individual, and to give to the public the consent and approbation of every free agent of the community.

According to the first formation of this excellent constitution, so long and so justly our greatest boast and best inheritance, we find that the people thus took care no laws should be enacted, no taxes levied, but by their consent, expressed by their representatives in the great council of the nation. The mode of representation in ancient times being tolerably adequate and proportionate, the sense of the people was known by that of Parliament; their share of power in the legislature was preserved, and founded in equal justice; at present it is become insufficient, partial, and unjust. From so pleasing a view as that of the equal power which our ancestors had, with great wisdom and care, modelled for the commons of this realm, the present scene gives us not very venerable ruins of that majestic and beautiful fabric, the English constitution.

As the whole seems in disorder and confusion, all the former union and harmony of the parts are lost and destroyed. It appears, sir, from the writs remaining in the king's remembrancer's office in the exchequer, that no less than twenty-two towns sent members to the Parliaments in the 23d, 25th, and 26th, of King Edward I., which have long ceased to be represented. The names of some of them are scarcely known to us, such as those of Canebrig and Bamburgh in Northumberland, Pershore and Brem in Worcestershire, Jarvall and Tykhull in Yorkshire. What a happy fate, sir, has attended the boroughs of Gatton and Old Sarum, of which, although *ipsæ periere ruinæ*, the names are familiar to us; the clerk regularly calls them over, and four respectable gentlemen represent their departed greatness, as knights of coronation represent Aquitaine and Normandy! The little town of Banbury, *petite ville grand renom*, as Rabelais says of Chinon, has, I believe, only seventeen electors, and a chancellor of the exchequer. Its

* "A clear, correct, able, and eloquent speaker."—*Hazlitt.*

influence and weight, on a division, I have often seen overpower the united force of the members for London, Bristol, and several of the most opulent counties. East Grinstead too, I think, has only about thirty electors, yet gives a seat among us to that brave, heroic lord, at the head of a great department, now very military, who has fully determined to conquer America, but not in Germany. It is not, sir, my purpose, to weary the patience of the House by the researches of an antiquarian into the ancient state of our representation, and its variations at different periods. I shall only remark shortly on what passed in the reign of Henry VI. and some of his successors. In that reign, Sir John Fortescue, his chancellor, observed that the House of Commons consisted of more than 300 chosen men. Various alterations were made by succeeding kings till James II., since which period no change has happened. Great abuses, it must be owned, contrary to the primary ideas of the English constitution, were committed by our former princes, in giving the right of representation to several paltry boroughs, because the places were poor, and dependent on them, or on a favourite overgrown peer. The landmarks of the constitution have often been removed. The marked partiality to Cornwall, which single county still sends, within one, as many members as the whole kingdom of Scotland, is striking, and arose from its yielding to the Crown in tin and lands a larger hereditary revenue than any other English county, as well as from this duchy being in the Crown, and giving an amazing command and influence. By such acts of our princes the constitution was wounded in its most vital parts. Henry VIII. restored two members, Edward VI. twenty, Queen Mary four, Queen Elizabeth twelve, James I. sixteen, Charles I. eighteen; in all seventy-two. The alterations by creation in the same period were more considerable; for Henry VIII. created thirty-three, Edward VI. twenty-eight, Queen Mary seventeen, Queen Elizabeth forty-eight, James I. eleven; in all 137. Charles I. made no creation of this kind. Charles II. added two for the county, and two for the city of Durham, and two for Newmarket-on-Trent. This House is at this hour composed of the same representation it was at his demise, notwithstanding the many and important changes which have since happened; it becomes us therefore to inquire, whether the sense of Parliament can be now, on solid grounds, from the present representation, said to be the sense of the nation, as in the time of our forefathers. I am satisfied, sir, the sentiments of the people cannot be justly known at this time, from the resolutions of a Parliament, composed as the present is, even though no undue influence was practised after the return of the members to the House; even supposing for a moment the influence of all the baneful arts of corruption to be suspended, which, for a moment, I believe they have not been, under the present profligate administration. Let us examine, sir, with exactness and candour, of what the efficient parts of the House are composed, and what proportion they bear on the large scale to the body of the people of England, who are supposed to be represented.

The southern part of this island, to which I now confine my ideas, consists of about five millions of people, according to the most received calculation. I will state by what number the majority of this House is elected, and I suppose the largest number present of any recorded in our journals, which was in the famous year 1741. In that year the three largest divisions appear in our journals. The first is that on the 21st of January, when the numbers were 253 to 250; the second on the 25th day of the same month, 236 to 235; the third on the 9th of March, 242 to 242. In these divisions the members of Scotland are included; but I will state my calculations only for England, because it gives the argument more force. The division, therefore, I adopt, is that of January 21st; the number of members present on that day were 503. Let me, however, suppose the number of 254 to be the majority of members who will ever be able to attend in their places. I state it high, from the accidents of sickness, service in foreign parts, travelling, and necessary avocations. From the majority of electors in the boroughs which returned members to this House, it has been demonstrated that this number of 254 members are actually elected by no more than 5723 persons, generally the inhabitants of Cornish and other boroughs, and perhaps not the most respectable part of the community. Is our sovereign, then, to learn the sense of his whole people from these few persons? Are these the men to give laws to this vast empire, and to tax this wealthy nation? I do not mention all the tedious calculations, because gentlemen may find them at length in the works of the incomparable Dr Price, in Postlethwaite, and in Burgh's "Political Disquisitions." Figures afford the clearest demonstration, incapable of cavil or sophistry. Since Burgh's calculation, only one alteration has happened; I allude to the borough of Shoreham, in Sussex; for by the Act of 1771, all the freeholders of forty shillings per annum, in the neighbouring rape or hundred of Bramber, are admitted to vote for that borough, but many of the old electors were disfranchised. It appears, likewise, that fifty-six of our members are elected by only 364 persons. Lord Chancellor Talbot supposed that the majority of this House was elected by 50,000 persons, and he exclaimed against the injustice of that idea. More accurate calculators than his lordship, and the unerring rules of political arithmetic, have shown the injustice to be vastly beyond what his lordship even suspected. When we consider, sir, that the most important powers of this House, the

levying taxes on, and enacting laws for five millions of persons, is thus usurped and unconstitutionally exercised by the small number I have mentioned, it becomes our duty to the people to restore to them their clear rights, their original share in the legislature. The ancient representation of this kingdom, we find, was founded by our ancestors in justice, wisdom, and equality. The present state of it would be continued by us in folly, obstinacy, and injustice. The evil has been complained of by some of the wisest patriots our country has ever produced. I shall beg leave to give that close reasoner, Mr Locke's ideas, in his own words. He says, in the treatise on civil government: "Things not always changing equally, and private interests often keeping up customs and privileges, when the reasons of them are ceased, it often comes to pass, that in Governments where part of the legislature consists of representatives chosen by the people, that in tract of time this representation becomes very unequal and disproportionate to the reasons it was at first established upon. To what gross absurdities the following of a custom, when reason has left it, may lead, we may be satisfied, when we see the bare name of a town, of which there remains not so much as the ruins, where scarce so much housing as a sheep-cot, or more inhabitants than a shepherd, is to be found, sends as many representatives to the grand assembly of law-makers, as a whole county, numerous in people and powerful in riches. This strangers stand amazed at, and every one must confess, needs a remedy." After so great an authority as that of Mr Locke, I shall not be treated on this occasion as a mere visionary, and the propriety of the motion I shall have the honour of submitting to the House will scarcely be disputed. Even the members for such places as Old Sarum and Gatton, who I may venture to say at present *stant nominis umbræ*, will, I am persuaded, have too much candour to complain of the right of their few constituents, if indeed they have constituents, if they are not self-created, self-elected, self-existent, of this pretended right being transferred to the county, while the rich and populous manufacturing towns of Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds, Sheffield, and others, may have at least an equitable share in the formation of those laws by which they are governed. My idea, sir, in this case, as to the wretched and depopulated towns and boroughs in general, I own is amputation. I say with Horace, *Inutiles ramos amputans, feliciores inserit.* This is not, sir, the first attempt of the kind to correct, although in an inconsiderable degree, this growing evil. Proceedings of a similar nature were had among us above a century past. The clerk will read from our journals what passed on the 26th of March 1668, on a bill to enable the county palatine of Durham to send two knights for the county, and two citizens for the city of Durham.

[The clerk reads.] In a book of authority, "Anchitell Grey's Debates," we have a more particular account of what passed in the House on that occasion. He says that "Sir Thomas Meres moved, that the shires may have an increase of knights, and that some of the small boroughs, where there are but few electors, may be taken away; and a bill was brought in for that purpose." "On a division the bill was rejected, 65 to 50." This, however, alludes only to the bill then before the House, respecting the county and city of Durham. I desire to add the few remarkable words of Sir Thomas Strickland in this debate, because I have not seen them quoted on the late important American questions: "The county palatine of Durham was never taxed in Parliament, by ancient privilege, before King James's time, and so needed no representatives; but now being taxed, it is but reasonable they should have them." Such sentiments, sir, were promulgated in this House even so long ago as the reign of Charles II. I am aware, sir, that the power *de jure*, of the legislature to disfranchise a number of boroughs, upon the general grounds of improving the constitution, has been doubted; and gentlemen will ask, whether a power is lodged in the representative to destroy his immediate constituent? Such a question is best answered by another: How originated the right, and upon what grounds was it gained? Old Sarum and Gatton, for instance, were populous towns when the right of representation was first given them. They are now desolate, and therefore ought not to retain a privilege which they acquired only by their extent and populousness. We ought in everything, as far as we can, to make the theory and practice of the constitution coincide, and the supreme legislative body of a state must surely have this power inherent in them. It was *de facto* lately exercised to its full extent by this House in the case of Shoreham, with universal approbation: for near a hundred corrupt voters were disfranchised, and about twice that number of freeholders admitted from the county of Sussex. It will be objected, I foresee, that a time of perfect calm and peace throughout this vast empire is the most proper to propose internal regulations of this importance; and that while intestine discord rages in the whole northern continent of America, our attention ought to be fixed upon the most alarming object, and all our efforts employed to extinguish the devouring flame of a civil war. In my opinion, sir, the American war is, in this truly critical area, one of the strongest arguments for the regulations of our representation, which I now submit to the House. During the rest of our lives, likewise, I may venture to prophecy, America will be the leading feature of this age. In our late disputes with the Americans, we have always taken it for granted that the people of England justified all the iniquitous, cruel, arbitrary, and mad pro-

ceedings of administration, because they had the approbation of the majority of this House. The absurdity of such an argument is apparent; for the majority of this House, we know, speak only the sense of 5723 persons, even supposing, according to the constitutional custom of our ancestors, the constituent had been consulted on this great national point as he ought to have been. We have seen in what manner the acquiescence of a majority here is obtained. The people in the southern part of this island amount to upwards of five millions; the sense, therefore, of five millions, cannot be ascertained by the opinion of not six thousand, even supposing it had been collected. The Americans with great reason insist that the present war is carried on contrary to the sense of the nation, by a ministerial junto, and an arbitrary faction, equally hostile to the rights of Englishmen and the claims of Americans. The various addresses to the throne from the most numerous bodies, praying that the sword may be returned to the scabbard, and all hostilities cease, confirm this assertion. The capital of our country has repeatedly declared, by various public acts, its abhorrence of the present unnatural civil war, begun on principles subversive of our constitution.

Our history furnishes frequent instances of the sense of Parliament running directly counter to the sense of the nation. It was notoriously of late the case in the business of the Middlesex election. I believe the fact to be equally certain in the grand American dispute, at least as to the actual hostilities now carrying on against our brethren and fellow-subjects. The proposal before us will bring the case to an issue, and from a fair and equal representation of the people, America may at length distinguish the real sentiments of freemen and Englishmen. I do not mean, sir, at this time, to go into a tedious detail of all the various proposals which have been made for redressing this irregularity in the representation of the people. I will not intrude on the indulgence of the House, which I have always found so favourable to me. When the bill is brought in, and sent to a committee, it will be the proper time to examine all the minutiæ of this great plan, and to determine on the propriety of what ought now to be done, as well as of what formerly was actually accomplished. The journals of Cromwell's Parliaments prove that a more equal representation was settled, and carried by him into execution. That wonderful, comprehensive mind embraced the whole of this powerful empire. Ireland was put on a par with Scotland, and each kingdom sent thirty members to Parliament, which consisted likewise of 400 from England and Wales, and was to be triennial. Our colonies were then a speck on the face of the globe; now they cover half the New World. I will at this time, sir, only throw out general ideas, that every free agent in this kingdom should, in my wish, be represented in Parliament; that the metropolis, which contains in itself a ninth part of the people, and the counties of Middlesex, York, and others, which so greatly abound with inhabitants, should receive an increase in their representation; that the mean and insignificant boroughs, so emphatically styled the rotten part of our constitution, should be lopped off, and the electors in them thrown into the counties; and the rich, populous, trading towns, Birmingham, Manchester, Sheffield, Leeds, and others, be permitted to send deputies to the great council of the nation. The disfranchising of the mean, venal, and dependent boroughs, would be laying the axe to the root of corruption and treasury influence, as well as aristocratical tyranny. We ought equally to guard against those who sell themselves, or whose lords sell them. Burgage tenures, and private property in a share of the legislature, are monstrous absurdities in a free state, as well as an insult to common sense. I wish, sir, an English Parliament to speak the free, unbiassed sense of the body of the English people, and of every man among us, of each individual who may be justly supposed to be comprehended in a fair majority.

The meanest mechanic, the poorest peasant and day-labourer, has important rights respecting his personal liberty, that of his wife and children, his property, however inconsiderable, his wages, his earnings, the very price and value of each day's hard labour, which are in many trades and manufactures regulated by the power of Parliament. Every law relative to marriage, to the protection of a wife, sister, or daughter, against violence and brutal lust, to every contract or agreement with a rapacious or unjust master, interest the manufacturer, the cottager, the servant, as well as the rich subjects of the state. Some share, therefore, in the power of making those laws which deeply interest them, and to which they are expected to pay obedience, should be referred even to this inferior, but most useful set of men in the community; and we ought always to remember this important truth, acknowledged by every free state—that all government is instituted for the good of the mass of the people to be governed; that they are the original fountain of power, and even of revenue, and in all events, the last resource. The various instances of partial injustice throughout this kingdom will likewise become the proper subjects of inquiry in the course of the bill before the committee, such as the many freeholds in the city of London, which are not represented in this House. These freeholds being within the particular jurisdiction of the city, are excluded from giving a vote in the county of Middlesex, and by Act of Parliament only liverymen can vote for Members of Parliament in London. These, and other particulars, I leave. I mention them now to show the necessity of a new regulation of the representation of this kingdom. My

inquiries, sir, are confined to the southern part of the island. Scotland I leave to the care of its own careful and prudent sons. I hope they will spare a few moments from the management of the arduous affairs of England and America, which at present so much engross their time, to attend to the state of representation among their own people, if they have not all emigrated to this warmer and more fruitful climate. I am almost afraid that the forty-five Scottish gentlemen among us represent themselves. Perhaps in my plan for the improvement of the representation of England, almost all the natives of Scotland may be included. I shall only remark, that the proportion of representation between the two countries cannot be changed. In the twenty-second article of the Treaty of Union, the number of forty-five is to be the representative body in the Parliament of Great Britain for the northern part of this island. To increase the members for England and Wales beyond the number of which the English Parliament consisted at the period of that treaty, in 1706, would be a breach of public faith, and a violation of a solemn treaty between two independent states. My proposition has for its basis the preservation of that compact, the proportional share of each kingdom in the legislative body remaining exactly according to its establishment. The monstrous injustice and glaring partiality of the present representation of the commons of England, has been fully stated, and is, I believe, almost universally acknowledged, as well as the necessity of our recurring to the great leading principle of our free constitution, which declares this House of Parliament to be only a delegated power from the people at large. Policy, no less than justice, calls our attention to this momentous point; and reason, not custom, ought to be our guide in a business of this consequence, where the rights of a free people are materially interested. Without a true representation of the commons our constitution is essentially defective, our Parliament is a delusive name, a mere phantom, and all other remedies to recover the pristine purity of the form of government established by our ancestors, would be ineffectual; even the shortening the period of Parliaments, and a place and pension bill, both which I highly approve, and think absolutely necessary. I therefore flatter myself, sir, that I have the concurrence of the House with the motion which I have now the honour of making, "That leave be given to bring in a bill for a just and equal representation of the people of England in Parliament."

EDMUND BURKE.*

1730-1797.

PROTESTANT DISSENTERS' RELIEF BILL.

[NOTWITHSTANDING the fate of the Dissenters' Bill of 1772 in the House of Lords, another, upon similar principles, but with some additions, was this session brought into the House of Commons by Sir Henry Hoghton. After the motion for going into a committee on the bill had been opposed by Sir William Bagot and Mr Page,]

Mr BURKE rose and said: I assure you, sir, that the honourable gentleman who spoke last but one, need not be in the least fear that I should make a war of particles upon his opinion, whether the Church of England should, would, or ought to be alarmed. I am very clear that this House has no one reason in the world to think she is alarmed by the bill brought before you. It is something extraordinary that the only symptom of alarm in the Church of England should appear in the petition of some Dissenters, with whom I believe very few in this

---

* "Ignorant, indeed, or negligent of the art of adapting his reasonings and his style to the capacity and taste of his hearers, but in amplitude of comprehension and richness of imagination, superior to every orator, ancient or modern."—*Macaulay.*

"By far the greatest man of his age, not only abounding in knowledge himself, but feeding, in various directions, his most able contemporaries; assisting Adam Smith in his 'Political Economy,' and Reynolds in his 'Lectures on Painting.'"—*Wordsworth in Diary of Thomas Moore.*

"In Burke we have for the first time a deliberate retrospect of what society, in its ordinary and normal shape, has done for the human race, heightened by all that passion and rhetoric can do to recommend it to our approval. Just as the revolutionist in his dogmatism displays all the littleness and the intractibility of an ecclesiastic, so Burke communicates to his philosophy of society something of the depth and fervour of religion. The State, according to his solemn figure, which reflects alike the mode of thought of the great statesman and philosopher of Rome, and of our own English philosophical divines, is an emanation of the Divine will. . . . Burke stands unapproachably the first of our political orators, and, indeed, in the very first rank as a writer and a thinker. . . . Alike for language and method, he stands, for practical purposes, absolutely alone."—*E. J. Payne, M.A., in Burke's Select Works.*

House are yet acquainted, and of whom you know no more than that you are assured by the honourable gentleman that they are not Mohammedans. Of the Church we know they are not, by the name that they assume. They are then Dissenters. The first symptoms of an alarm comes from some Dissenters assembled round the lines of Chatham; these lines become the security of the Church of England. The honourable gentleman, in speaking of the lines of Chatham, tells us, that they serve not only for the security of the wooden walls of England, but for the defence of the Church of England. I suspect the wooden walls of England secure the lines of Chatham, rather than the lines of Chatham secure the wooden walls of England.

Sir, the Church of England, if only defended by this miserable petition upon your table, must, I am afraid, upon the principles of true fortification, be soon destroyed. But fortunately her walls, bulwarks, and bastions, are constructed of other materials than of stubble and straw; are built up with the strong and stable matter of the Gospel of liberty, and founded on a true, constitutional, legal establishment. But, sir, she has other securities; she has the security of her own doctrine; she has the security of the piety, the sanctity of her own professors; their learning is a bulwark to defend her; she has the security of the two universities, not shook in any single battlement, in any single pinnacle.

But the honourable gentleman has mentioned, indeed, principles which astonish me rather more than ever. The honourable gentleman thinks that the Dissenters enjoy a large share of liberty under a connivance; and he thinks that the establishing toleration by law is an attack upon Christianity.

The first of these is a contradiction in terms. Liberty under a connivance. Connivance is a relaxation from slavery, not a definition of liberty. What is connivance, but a state under which all slaves live? If I was to describe slavery, I would say with those who hate it, it is living under will, not under law; if, as it is stated by its advocates, I would say that, like earthquakes, like thunder, or other wars the elements make upon mankind, it happens rarely, it occasionally comes now and then upon people, who upon ordinary occasions enjoy the same legal government of liberty. Take it under the description of those who would soften those features, the state of slavery and connivance is the same thing. If the liberty enjoyed be a liberty not of toleration but of connivance, the only question is, whether establishing such by law is an attack upon Christianity. Toleration an attack upon Christianity? What, then, are we to come to this pass, to suppose that nothing can support Christianity but the principles of persecution? Is that, then, the idea of establishment? It is, then, the idea of Christianity itself, that it ought to have establishments, that it ought to have laws against Dissenters, but the breach of which laws is to be connived at! What a picture of toleration; what a picture of laws, of establishments; what a picture of religious and civil liberty! I am persuaded the honourable gentleman does not see it in this light. But these very terms become the strongest reasons for my support of the bill; for I am persuaded that toleration, so far from being an attack upon Christianity, becomes the best and surest support, that possibly can be given to it. The Christian religion itself arose without establishment, it arose even without toleration; and whilst its own principles were not tolerated, it conquered all the powers of darkness, it conquered all the powers of the world. The moment it began to depart from these principles, it converted the establishment into tyranny; it subverted its foundations from that very hour. Zealous as I am for the principle of an establishment, so just an abhorrence do I conceive against whatever may shake it. I know nothing but the supposed necessity of persecution, that can make an establishment disgusting. I would have toleration a part of establishment, as a principle favourable to Christianity, and as a part of Christianity.

All seem agreed that the law, as it stands, inflicting penalties on all religious teachers and on schoolmasters, who do not sign the Thirty-nine Articles of religion, ought not to be executed. We are all agreed that the law is not good; for that, I presume, is undoubtedly the idea of a law that ought not to be executed. The question therefore is, whether in a well-constituted, commonwealth—which we desire ours to be thought, and, I trust, intend that it should be—whether in such a commonwealth it is wise to retain those laws, which it is not proper to execute? A penal law, not ordinarily put in execution, seems to me to be a very absurd and a very dangerous thing. For if its principles be right, if the object of its prohibitions and penalties be a real evil, then you do in effect permit that very evil, which not only the reason of the thing, but your very law, declares ought not to be permitted; and thus it reflects exceedingly on the wisdom, and consequently derogates not a little from the authority, of a legislature, who can at once forbid and suffer, and in the same breath promulgate penalty and indemnity to the same persons, and for the very same actions. But if the object of the law be no moral or political evil, then you ought not to hold even a terror to those whom you ought certainly not to punish—for if it is not right to hurt, it is neither right nor wise to menace. Such laws, therefore, as they must be defective either in justice or wisdom, or both, so they cannot exist without a considerable degree of danger. Take them which way you will, they are pressed with ugly alternatives.

1. All penal laws are either upon popular

prosecution, or on the part of the Crown. Now, if they may be roused from their sleep, whenever a minister thinks proper, as instruments of oppression, then they put vast bodies of men into a state of slavery and court dependence; since their liberty of conscience and their power of executing their functions depend entirely on his will. I would have no man derive his means of continuing any function, or his being restrained from it, but from the laws only; they should be his only superior and sovereign lords.

2. They put statesmen and magistrates into a habit of playing fast and loose with the laws, straining or relaxing them as may best suit their political purposes; and in that light tend to corrupt the executive power through all its offices.

3. If they are taken up on popular actions, their operation in that light also is exceedingly evil. They become the instruments of private malice, private avarice, and not of public regulation; they nourish the worst of men to the prejudice of the best, punishing tender consciences, and rewarding informers.

"Shall we, as the honourable gentleman tells us we may, with perfect security trust to the manners of the age? I am well pleased with the general manners of the times; but the desultory execution of penal laws, the thing I condemn, does not depend on the manners of the times. I would, however, have the laws tuned in unison with the manners—very dissonant are a gentle country, and cruel laws; very dissonant, that your reason is furious, but your passions moderate, and that you are always equitable except in your courts of justice.

I will beg leave to state to the House one argument, which has been much relied upon—that the Dissenters are not unanimous upon this business; that many persons are alarmed; that it will create a disunion among the Dissenters.

When any Dissenters, or any body of people, come here with a petition, it is not the number of people, but the reasonableness of the request, that should weigh with the House. A body of Dissenters come to this House and say, "Tolerate us—we desire neither the parochial advantage of tithes, nor dignities, nor the stalls of your cathedrals; no, let the venerable orders of the hierarchy exist with all their advantages." And shall I tell them, I reject your just and reasonable petition, not because it shakes the Church, but because there are others, while you lie grovelling upon the earth, that will kick and bite you? Judge which of these descriptions of men comes with a fair request—that which says, Sir, I desire liberty for my own, because I trespass on no man's conscience; or the other, which says, I desire that these men should not be suffered to act according to their consciences, though I am tolerated to act according to mine. But I sign a body of articles, which is my title to toleration; I sign no more, because more are against my conscience. But I desire that you will not tolerate these men, because they will not go so far as I, though I desire to be tolerated, who will not go as far as you. No, imprison them, if they come within five miles of a corporate town, because they do not believe what I do in point of doctrines.

Shall I not say to these men, *Arrangez vous, canaille?* You, who are not the predominant power, will not give to others the relaxation under which you are yourself suffered to live. I have as high an opinion of the doctrines of the Church as you. I receive them implicitly, or I put my own explanation on them, or take that which seems to me to come best recommended by authority. There are those of the Dissenters, who think more rigidly of the doctrine of the Articles relative to predestination than others do. They sign the article relative to it *ex animo*, and literally. Others allow a latitude of construction. These two parties are in the Church, as well as among the Dissenters; yet in the Church we live quietly under the same roof. I do not see why, as long as Providence gives us no further light into this great mystery, we shall not leave things as the Divine wisdom has left them. But suppose all these things to me to be clear (which Providence, however, seems to have left obscure), yet whilst Dissenters claim a toleration in things, which, seeming clear to me, are obscure to them, without entering into the merit of the Articles, with what face can these men say, Tolerate us, but do not tolerate them? Toleration is good for all, or it is good for none.

The discussion this day is not between establishment on one hand, and toleration on the other, but between those who, being tolerated themselves, refuse toleration to others. That power should be puffed up with pride, that authority should degenerate into rigour, if not laudable, is but too natural. But this proceeding of theirs is much beyond the usual allowance to human weakness; it not only is shocking to our reason, but it provokes our indignation. *Quid domini facient, audent cum talia fures?* It is not the proud prelate thundering in his commission court, but a pack of manumitted slaves with the lash of the beadle flagrant on their backs, and their legs still galled with their fetters, that would drive their brethren into that prison-house from whence they have just been permitted to escape. If, instead of puzzling themselves in the depths of the Divine counsels, they would turn to the mild morality of the Gospel, they would read their own condemnation —"O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt because thou desiredst me; shouldest not thou also have compassion on thy fellow-servant, even as I had pity on thee?"

In my opinion, sir, a magistrate, whenever he goes to put any restraint upon religious freedom, can only do it upon this ground, that the person dissenting does not dissent from the scruples of

ill-informed conscience, but from a party ground of dissension, in order to raise a faction in the state. We give, with regard to rights and ceremonies, an indulgence to tender consciences. But if dissent is at all punished in any country, if at all it can be punished upon any pretence, it is upon a presumption, not that a man is supposed to differ conscientiously from the establishment, but that he resists truth for the sake of faction; that he abets diversity of opinions in religion to distract the state, and to destroy the peace of his country. This is the only plausible, for there is no true ground of persecution. As the laws stand, therefore, let us see how we have thought fit to act.

If there is any one thing within the competency of a magistrate with regard to religion, it is this, that he has a right to direct the exterior ceremonies of religion; that whilst interior religion is within the jurisdiction of God alone, the external part, bodily action, is within the province of the chief governor. Hooker, and all the great lights of the Church, have constantly argued this to be a part within the province of the civil magistrate; but look at the Act of Toleration of William and Mary, there you will see the civil magistrate has not only dispensed with those things, which are more particularly within his province, with those things which faction might be supposed to take up for the sake of making visible and external divisions, and raising a standard of revolt, but has also from sound politic considerations relaxed on those points which are confessedly without his province.

The honourable gentleman, speaking of the heathens, certainly could not mean to recommend anything that is derived from that impure source. But he has praised the tolerating spirit of the heathens. Well! but the honourable gentleman will recollect that heathens, that polytheists, must permit a number of divinities. It is the very essence of its constitution. But was it ever heard that polytheism tolerated a dissent from a polytheistic establishment? the belief of one God only? Never, never! Sir, they constantly carried on persecution against that doctrine. I will not give heathens the glory of a doctrine which I consider the best part of Christianity. The honourable gentleman must recollect the Roman law, that was clearly against the introduction of any foreign rites in matters of religion. You have it at large in Livy, how they persecuted in the first introduction the rites of Bacchus: and even before Christ, to say nothing of their subsequent persecutions, they persecuted the Druids and others. Heathenism, therefore, as in other respects erroneous, was erroneous in point of persecution. I do not say every heathen who persecuted was therefore an impious man; I only say he was mistaken, as such a man is now. But, says the honourable gentleman, they did not persecute Epicureans. No; the Epicureans had no quarrel with their religious establishment, nor desired any religion for themselves. It would have been very extraordinary if irreligious heathens had desired either a religious establishment or toleration. But, says the honourable gentleman, the Epicureans entered, as others, into the temples. They did so; they defied all subscription; they defied all sorts of conformity; there was no subscription to which they were not ready to set their hands, no ceremonies they refused to practise; they made it a principle of their irreligion outwardly to conform to any religion. These atheists eluded all that you could do; so will all freethinkers for ever. Then you suffer, or the weakness of your law has suffered, those great dangerous animals to escape notice, whilst you have nets that entangle the poor fluttering silken wings of a tender conscience.

The honourable gentleman insists much upon this circumstance of objection, namely, the division amongst the Dissenters. Why, sir, the Dissenters, by the nature of the term, are open to have a division among themselves. They are Dissenters because they differ from the Church of England, not that they agree among themselves. There are Presbyterians, there are Independents, some that do not agree to infant baptism, others that do not agree to the baptism of adults, or any baptism. All these are, however, tolerated under the Acts of King William, and subsequent Acts; and their diversity of sentiments with one another did not, and could not, furnish an argument against their toleration, when their difference with ourselves furnished none.

But, says the honourable gentleman, if you suffer them to go on, they will shake the fundamental principles of Christianity. Let it be considered that this argument goes as strongly against connivance, which you allow, as against toleration, which you reject. The gentleman sets out with a principle of perfect liberty, or, as he describes it, connivance. But, for fear of dangerous opinions, you leave it in your power to vex a man who has not held any one dangerous opinion whatsoever. If one man is a professed atheist, another man the best Christian, but dissents from two of the Thirty-nine Articles, I may let escape the atheist, because I know him to be an atheist, because I am, perhaps, so inclined myself, and because I may connive where I think proper; but the conscientious Dissenter, on account of his attachment to that general religion, which perhaps I hate, I shall take care to punish, because I may punish when I think proper. Therefore, connivance being an engine of private malice or private favour, not of good government—an engine which totally fails of suppressing atheism, but oppresses conscience; I say that principle becomes not serviceable, but dangerous to Christianity; that it is not toleration, but contrary to it, even contrary

to peace; that the penal system, to which it belongs, is a dangerous principle in the economy either of religion or government.

The honourable gentleman, and in him I comprehend all those who oppose the bill, bestowed in support of their side of the question as much argument as it could bear, and much more of learning and decoration than it deserved. He thinks connivance consistent, but legal toleration inconsistent, with the interests of Christianity. Perhaps I would go as far as that honourable gentleman, if I thought toleration inconsistent with those interests. God forbid! I may be mistaken, but I take toleration to be a part of religion. I do not know which I would sacrifice; I would keep them both; it is not necessary I should sacrifice either. I do not like the idea of tolerating the doctrines of Epicurus; but nothing in the world propagates them so much as the oppression of the poor, of the honest, and candid disciples of the religion we profess in common, I mean revealed religion; nothing sooner makes them take a short cut out of the bondage of sectarian vexation into open and direct infidelity than tormenting men for every difference. My opinion is, that in establishing the Christian religion wherever you find it, curiosity or research is its best security; and in this way a man is a great deal better justified in saying, Tolerate all kinds of consciences, than in imitating the heathens, whom the honourable gentleman quotes, in tolerating those who have none. I am not over fond of calling for the secular arm upon these misguided or misguiding men; but if ever it ought to be raised, it ought surely to be raised against these very men, not against others, whose liberty of religion you make a pretext for proceedings which drive them into the bondage of impiety. What figure do I make in saying, I do not attack the works of these atheistical writers, but I will keep a rod hanging over the conscientious man, their bitterest enemy, because these atheists may take advantage of the liberty of their foes to introduce irreligion? The best book that ever, perhaps, has been written against these people is that in which the author has collected in a body the whole of the infidel code, and has brought the writers into one body to cut them all off together. This was done by a Dissenter, who never did subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles—Dr Leland. But if, after all, this danger is to be apprehended, if you are really fearful that Christianity will indirectly suffer by this liberty, you have my free consent; go directly, and by the straight way, and not by a circuit, in which in your road you may destroy your friends, point your arms against these men, who do the mischief you fear promoting; point your arms against men who, not contented with endeavouring to turn your eyes from the blaze and effulgence of light, by which life and immortality is so gloriously demonstrated by the Gospel, would even extinguish that faint glimmering of nature, that only comfort supplied to ignorant man before this great illumination—them, who, by attacking even the possibility of all revelation, arraign all the dispensations of Providence to man. These are the wicked Dissenters you ought to fear; these are the people against whom you ought to aim the shaft of the law; these are the men to whom, arrayed in all the terrors of government, I would say, You shall not degrade us into brutes; these men, these factious men, as the honourable gentleman properly called them, are the just objects of vengeance, not the conscientious Dissenter; these men, who would take away whatever ennobles the rank or consoles the misfortunes of human nature, by breaking off that connection of observances, of affections, of hopes and fears which bind us to the Divinity, and constitute the glorious and distinguishing prerogative of humanity, that of being a religious creature; against these I would have the laws rise in all their majesty of terrors to fulminate such vain and impious wretches, and to awe them into impotence by the only dread they can fear or believe, to learn that eternal lesson—*Discite justitiam moniti, et non temnere Divos.*

At the same time that I would cut up the very root of atheism I would respect all conscience—all conscience that is really such, and which perhaps its very tenderness proves to be sincere. I wish to see the Established Church of England great and powerful; I wish to see her foundations laid low and deep, that she may crush the giant powers of rebellious darkness; I would have her head raised up to that heaven to which she conducts us. I would have her open wide her hospitable gates by a noble and liberal comprehension; but I would have no breaches in her wall; I would have her cherish all those who are within, and pity all those who are without; I would have her a common blessing to the world—an example, if not an instructor, to those who have not the happiness to belong to her; I would have her give a lesson of peace to mankind, that a vexed and wandering generation might be taught to seek for repose and toleration in the maternal bosom of Christian charity, and not in the harlot lap of infidelity and indifference. Nothing has driven people more into that house of seduction than the mutual hatred of Christian congregations. Long may we enjoy our Church under a learned and edifying Episcopacy. But Episcopacy may fail, and religion exist. The most horrid and cruel blow that can be offered to civil society is through atheism. Do not promote diversity; when you have it, bear it; have as many sorts of religion as you find in your country; there is a reasonable worship in them all. The others, the infidels, are outlaws of the constitution; not of this country, but of the human race. They are never, never to be supported, never to be tolerated. Under

the systematic attacks of these people, I see some of the props of good government already begin to fail; I see propagated principles which will not leave to religion even a toleration. I see myself sinking every day under the attacks of these wretched people. How shall I arm myself against them? By uniting all those in affection who are united in the belief of the great principles of the Godhead, that made and sustains the world. They who hold revelation give double assurance to their country. Even the man who does not hold revelation, yet who wishes that it were proved to him, who observes a pious silence with regard to it; such a man, though not a Christian, is governed by religious principles. Let him be tolerated in this country. Let it be but a serious religion, natural or revealed, take what you can get; cherish, blow up the slightest spark. One day it may be a pure and holy flame. By this proceeding you form an alliance, offensive and defensive, against those great ministers of darkness in the world who are endeavouring to shake all the works of God established in order and beauty.

Perhaps I am carried too far, but it is in the road into which the honourable gentleman has led me. The honourable gentleman would have us fight this confederacy of the powers of darkness with the single arm of the Church of England; would have us not only fight against infidelity, but fight at the same time with all the faith in the world, except our own. In the moment we make a front against the common enemy, we have to combat with all those who are the natural friends of our cause. Strong as we are, we are not equal to this. The cause of the Church of England is included in that of religion, not that of religion in the Church of England. I will stand up at all times for the rights of conscience, as it is such, not for its particular modes against its general principles. One may be right, another mistaken; but if I have more strength than my brother, it shall be employed to support, not oppress his weakness; if I have more light, it shall be used to guide, not to dazzle him. . . .

[The fortune of this bill was exactly the same as that of the preceding year; it was carried through all its stages in the one House by a great majority, and rejected in the same manner by the other.]

AMERICAN TAXATION.*

[MR ROSE FULLER, member for Rye, made the following motion: "That an Act made in the seventh year of the reign of his present Majesty, intituled, 'An Act for granting certain duties in the British colonies and plantations in America; for allowing a drawback of the duties of customs upon the exportation from this kingdom of coffee and cocoa-nuts, of the produce of the said colonies or plantations; for discontinuing the drawbacks payable on china earthenware exported to America; and for more effectually preventing the clandestine running of goods, and in the said colonies and plantations' might be read." And the same being read accordingly, he moved, "That this House will, upon this day sevennight, resolve itself into a committee of the whole House to take into consideration the duty of 3d. per pound weight upon tea, payable in all his Majesty's dominions in America, imposed by the said Act; and also the appropriation of the said duty."

Remarking on this speech, Mr Goodrich says, "No one had ever been delivered in the Parliament of Great Britain so full at once of deep research, cogent reasoning, cutting sarcasm, graphic description, profound political wisdom, and fervid declamation." In discussing the subject, Mr Burke confined himself to the single question, "Ought the tax on tea to be abandoned, and with it the entire scheme of raising a parliamentary revenue out of the colonies?"]

SIR,—I agree with the honourable gentleman* who spoke last, that this subject is not new in this House. Very disagreeably to this House, very unfortunately to this nation, and to the peace and prosperity of this whole empire, no topic has been more familiar to us. For nine long years, session after session, we have been lashed round and round this miserable circle of occasional arguments and temporary expedients. I am sure our heads must turn, and our stomachs nauseate with them. We have had them in every shape; we have looked at them in every point of view. Invention is exhausted; reason is fatigued; experience has given judgment; but obstinacy is not yet conquered.

The honourable gentleman has made one endeavour more to diversify the form of this disgusting argument. He has thrown out a speech composed almost entirely of challenges. Challenges are serious things; and, as he is a man of prudence as well as resolution, I dare say he has very well weighed those challenges before he delivered them. I had long the happiness to sit at the same side of the House, and to agree with the honourable gentleman on all the American questions. My sentiments, I am sure, are well known to him; and I thought I had been perfectly acquainted with his. Though I find myself mistaken, he will still permit me to use the privilege of an old friendship; he will permit me to apply myself to the House under the sanction of his authority; and on the various grounds he

* A speech delivered in the House of Commons, April 19, 1774.

* Charles Wolfran Cornwall, Esq., one of the Lords of the Treasury, and afterwards Speaker of the House of Commons.

has measured out, to submit to you the poor opinions which I have formed upon a matter of importance enough to demand the fullest consideration I could bestow upon it.

He has stated to the House two grounds of deliberation, one narrow and simple, and merely confined to the question on your paper; the other more large and complicated; comprehending the whole series of the parliamentary proceedings with regard to America, their causes, and their consequences. With regard to the latter ground, he states it as useless, and thinks it may be even dangerous to enter into so extensive a field of inquiry. Yet, to my surprise, he has hardly laid down this restrictive proposition, to which his authority would have given so much weight, when directly, and with the same authority, he condemns it, and declares it absolutely necessary to enter into the most ample historical detail. His zeal has thrown him a little out of his usual accuracy. In this perplexity, what shall we do, sir, who are willing to submit to the law he gives us? He has reprobated in one part of his speech the rule he had laid down for debate in the other; and, after narrowing the ground for all those who are to speak after him, he takes an excursion himself, as unbounded as the subject and the extent of his great abilities.

Sir, when I cannot obey all his laws, I will do the best I can. I will endeavour to obey such of them as have the sanction of his example; and to stick to that rule, which, though not consistent with the other, is the most rational. He was certainly in the right when he took the matter largely. I cannot prevail on myself to agree with him in his censure of his own conduct. It is not, he will give me leave to say, either useless or dangerous. He asserts that retrospect is not wise; and the proper, the only proper subject of inquiry is, "not how we got into this difficulty, but how we are to get out of it." In other words, we are, according to him, to consult our invention and to reject our experience. The mode of deliberation he recommends is diametrically opposite to every rule of reason, and every principle of good sense established among mankind; for that sense and that reason I have always understood absolutely to prescribe, whenever we are involved in difficulties from the measures we have pursued, that we should take a strict review of those measures, in order to correct our errors, if they should be corrigible; or at least to avoid a dull uniformity in mischief, and the unpitied calamity of being repeatedly caught in the same snare.

Sir, I will freely follow the honourable gentleman in his historical discussion, without the least management for men or measures, further than as they shall seem to me to deserve it. But before I go into that large consideration, because I would omit nothing that can give the House satisfaction, I wish to tread—

I. The NARROW GROUND, to which alone the honourable gentleman in one part of his speech has so strictly confined us.

(1.) He desires to know whether, if we were to repeal this tax agreeably to the proposition of the honourable gentleman who made the motion, the Americans would not take post on this concession, in order to make a new attack on the next body of taxes; and whether they would not call for a repeal of the duty on wine as loudly as they do now for the repeal of the duty on tea? Sir, I can give no security on this subject. But I will do all that I can, and all that can be fairly demanded. To the experience which the honourable gentleman reprobates in one instant and reverts to in the next; to that experience, without the least wavering or hesitation on my part, I steadily appeal; and would to God there was no other arbiter to decide on the vote with which the House is to conclude this day!

When Parliament repealed the Stamp Act in the year 1766, I affirm, first, that the Americans did *not*, in consequence of this measure, call upon you to give up the former parliamentary revenue which subsisted in that country, or even any one of the articles which compose it. I affirm, also, that when, departing from the maxims of that repeal, you revived the scheme of taxation, and thereby filled the minds of the colonists with new jealousy and all sorts of apprehension, then it was that they quarrelled with the old taxes as well as the new; then it was, and not till then, that they questioned all the parts of your legislative power; and by the battery of such questions have shaken the solid structure of this empire to its deepest foundations.

Of those two propositions I shall, before I have done, give such convincing, such damning proof, that, however the contrary may be whispered in circles, or bawled in newspapers, they never more will dare to raise their voices in this House. I speak with great confidence. I have reason for it. The ministers are with me. *They*, at least, are convinced that the repeal of the Stamp Act had not, and that no repeal can have, the consequences which the honourable gentleman who defends their measures is so much alarmed at. To their conduct I refer him for a conclusive answer to his objection. I carry my proof irresistibly into the very body of both ministry and Parliament; not on any general reasoning growing out of collateral matter, but on the conduct of the honourable gentleman's ministerial friends on the new revenue itself.

The Act of 1767, which grants this tea duty, sets forth in its preamble that it was expedient to raise a revenue in America for the support of the civil government there, as well as for purposes still more extensive. To this support the Act assigns six branches of duties. About two years after this Act passed, the ministry—I mean the present ministry—thought it expedient to

repeal five of the duties, and to leave, for reasons best known to themselves, only the sixth standing. Suppose any person, at the time of that repeal, had thus addressed the minister: "Condemning, as you do, the repeal of the Stamp Act, why do you venture to repeal the duties upon glass, paper, and painters' colours? Let your pretence for the repeal be what it will, are you not thoroughly convinced that your concessions will produce, not satisfaction, but insolence, in the Americans; and that the giving up these taxes will necessitate the giving up of all the rest?" This objection was as palpable then as it is now; and it was as good for preserving the five duties as for retaining the sixth. Besides, the minister will recollect that the repeal of the Stamp Act had but just preceded his repeal; and the ill policy of that measure (had it been so impolitic as it has been represented), and the mischiefs it produced, were quite recent. Upon the principles, therefore, of the honourable gentleman, upon the principles of the minister himself, the minister has nothing at all to answer. He stands condemned by himself, and by all his associates, old and new, as a destroyer, in the first trust of finance, in the revenues; and in the first rank of honour, as a betrayer of the dignity of his country.

Most men, especially great men, do not always know their well-wishers. I come to rescue that noble lord out of the hands of those he calls his friends, and even out of his own. I will do him the justice he is denied at home. He has not been this wicked or imprudent man. He knew that a repeal had no tendency to produce the mischiefs which give so much alarm to his honourable friend. His work was not bad in its principle, but imperfect in its execution; and the motion on your paper presses him only to complete a proper plan, which, by some unfortunate and unaccountable error, he had left unfinished.

I hope, sir, the honourable gentleman who spoke last is thoroughly satisfied, and satisfied out of the proceedings of the ministry on their own favourite Act, that his fears from a repeal are groundless. If he is not, I leave him, and the noble lord who sits by him, to settle the matter, as well as they can, together; for if the repeal of American taxes destroys all our government in America—he is the man!—and he is the worst of all the repealers, because he is the last.

(2.) But I hear it continually rung in my ears, now and formerly, "The *preamble!* what will become of the preamble, if you repeal this tax?" I am sorry to be compelled so often to expose the calamities and disgraces of Parliament. The preamble of this law, standing as it now stands, has the lie direct given to it by the provisionary part of the Act; if that can be called provisionary which makes no provision. I should be afraid to express myself in this manner, especially in the face of such a formidable array of ability as is now drawn up before me, composed of the ancient household troops of that side of the House, and the new recruits from this, if the matter were not clear and indisputable. Nothing but truth could give me this firmness; but plain truth and clear evidence can be beat down by no ability. The clerk will be so good as to turn to the Act, and to read this favourite preamble.

[It was read in the following words:

"Whereas it is expedient that a revenue should be raised in your Majesty's dominions in America, for making a more certain and adequate provision for defraying the charge of the administration of justice and support of civil government in such provinces where it shall be found necessary, and toward further defraying the expenses of defending, protecting, and securing the said dominions."]

You have heard this pompous performance. Now where is the revenue which is to do all these mighty things? Five-sixths repealed—abandoned—sunk—gone—lost for ever. Does the poor solitary tea duty support the purposes of this preamble? Is not the supply there stated as effectually abandoned as if the tea duty had perished in the general wreck? Here, Mr Speaker, is a precious mockery—a preamble without an Act—taxes granted in order to be repealed—and the reasons of the grant still carefully kept up! This is raising a revenue in America! This is preserving dignity in England! If you repeal this tax in compliance with the motion, I readily admit that you lose this fair preamble. Estimate your loss in it. The object of the Act is gone already; and all you suffer is the purging the statute-book of the opprobrium of an empty, absurd, and false recital.

It has been said again and again, that the five taxes were repealed on commercial principles. It is so said in the paper in my hand—a paper which I constantly carry about, which I have often used, and shall often use again. What is got by this paltry pretence of commercial principles I know not; for, if your government in America is destroyed by the repeal of taxes, it is of no consequence upon what ideas the repeal is grounded. Repeal this tax, too, upon commercial principles, if you please. These principles will serve as well now as they did formerly. But you know that either your objection to a repeal from these supposed consequences has no validity, or that this pretence never could remove it. This commercial motive never was believed by any man, either in America, which this letter is meant to soothe, or in England, which it is meant to deceive. It was impossible it should; because every man, in the least acquainted with the detail of commerce, must know, that several of the articles on which the tax was repealed were fitter objects of duties than almost any other articles that could possibly be chosen; without comparison more so than the tea that was left taxed, as infinitely less liable to be

eluded by contraband. The tax upon red and white lead was of this nature. You have in this kingdom an advantage in lead that amounts to a monopoly. When you find yourself in this situation of advantage, you sometimes venture to tax even your own export. You did so soon after the last war, when upon this principle you ventured to impose a duty on coals. In all the articles of American contraband trade, who ever heard of the smuggling of red lead and white lead? You might, therefore, well enough, without danger of contraband, and without injury to commerce (if this were the whole consideration), have taxed these commodities. The same may be said of glass. Besides, some of the things taxed were so trivial, that the loss of the objects themselves, and their utter annihilation out of American commerce, would have been comparatively as nothing. But is the article of tea such an object in the trade of England as not to be felt, or felt but slightly, like white lead, and red lead, and painters' colours? Tea is an object of far other importance. Tea is perhaps the most important object, taking it with its necessary connections, of any in the mighty circle of our commerce. If commercial principles had been the true motives to the repeal, or had they been at all attended to, *tea would have been the last article we should have left taxed for a subject of controversy.*

Sir, it is not a pleasant consideration; but nothing in the world can read so awful and so instructive a lesson as the conduct of ministry in this business upon the mischief of not having large and liberal ideas in the management of great affairs. Never have the servants of the state looked at the whole of your complicated interests in one connected view. They have taken things by bits and scraps, some at one time and one pretence; and some at another, just as they pressed, without any sort of regard to their relations or dependencies. They never had any kind of system, right or wrong, but only invented occasionally some miserable tale for the day, in order meanly to sneak out of difficulties into which they had proudly strutted. And they were put to all these shifts and devices, full of meanness and full of mischief, in order to pilfer piecemeal a repeal of an Act which they had not the generous courage, when they found and felt their error, honourably and fairly to disclaim. By such management, by the irresistible operation of feeble counsels, so paltry a sum as threepence in the eyes of a financier, so insignificant an article as tea in the eyes of a philosopher, have shaken the pillars of a commercial empire that circled the whole globe.

Do you forget that, in the very last year, you stood on the precipice of a general bankruptcy? Your danger was indeed great. You were distressed in the affairs of the East India Company; and you well know what sort of things are involved in the comprehensive energy of that significant appellation. I am not called upon to enlarge to you on that danger, which you thought proper yourselves to aggravate, and to display to the world with all the parade of indiscreet declamation. The monopoly of the most lucrative trades and the possession of imperial revenues had brought you to the verge of beggary and ruin. Such was your representation—such, in some measure, was your case. The vent of ten millions of pounds of this commodity, now locked up by the operation of an injudicious tax, and rotting in the warehouses of the Company, would have prevented all this distress, and all that series of desperate measures which you thought yourselves obliged to take in consequence of it. America would have furnished that vent, which no other part of the world can furnish but America; where tea is next to a necessary of life, and where the demand grows upon the supply. I hope our dear-bought East India committees have done us at least so much good as to let us know, that without a more extensive sale of that article, our East India revenues and acquisitions can have no certain connection with this country. It is through the American trade of tea that your East India conquests are to be prevented from crushing you with their burden. They are ponderous indeed; and they must have that great country to lean upon, or they tumble upon your head. It is the same folly that has lost you at once the benefit of the West and of the East. This folly has thrown open folding-doors to contraband, and will be the means of giving the profits of the trade of your colonies to every nation but yourselves. Never did a people suffer so much for the empty words of a preamble. It must be given up. For on what principle does it stand? This famous revenue stands, at this hour, on all the debate, as a description of revenue not as yet known in all the comprehensive, but too comprehensive! vocabulary of finance—*a preambulary tax.* It is, indeed, a tax of sophistry, a tax of pedantry, a tax of disputation, a tax of war and rebellion, a tax for anything but benefit to the imposers, or satisfaction to the subject.

(3.) Well! but, whatever it is, gentlemen will force the colonists to take the teas. You will force them? Has seven years' struggle been yet able to force them? Oh, but it seems we are yet in the *right.* The tax is "*trifling*—in effect, it is rather an exoneration than an imposition; three-fourths of the duty formerly payable on teas exported to America is taken off; the place of collection is only shifted; instead of the retention of a shilling from the drawback here, it is threepence custom paid in America." All this, sir, is very true. But this is the very folly and mischief of the Act. Incredible as it may seem, you know that you have deliberately thrown away a large duty which you held secure and quiet in your hands, for the vain hope of getting one three-fourths

less, through every hazard, through certain litigation, and possibly through war.

The manner of proceeding in the duties on paper and glass imposed by the same Act was exactly in the same spirit. There are heavy excises on those articles when used in England. On export, these excises are drawn back. But instead of withholding the drawback, which might have been done, with ease, without charge, without possibility of smuggling; and instead of applying the money (money already in your hands) according to your pleasure, you began your operations in finance by flinging away your revenue; you allowed the whole drawback on export, and then you charged the duty (which you had before discharged) payable in the colonies, where it was certain the collection would devour it to the bone, if any revenue were ever suffered to be collected at all. One spirit pervades and animates the whole mass.

Could anything be a subject of more just alarm to America than to see you go out of the plain high road of finance, and give up your most certain revenues and your clearest interest merely for the sake of insulting your colonies? No man ever doubted that the commodity of tea could bear an imposition of threepence. But no commodity will bear threepence, or will bear a penny, when the general feelings of men are irritated, and two millions of people are resolved not to pay. The feelings of the colonies were formerly the feelings of Great Britain. Theirs were formerly the feelings of Mr Hampden when called upon for the payment of twenty shillings. Would twenty shillings have ruined Mr Hampden's fortune? No, but the payment of half twenty shillings, on the principle it was demanded, would have made him a slave. It is the weight of that preamble, of which you are so fond, and not the weight of the duty, that the Americans are unable and unwilling to bear.

It is then, sir, upon the principle of this measure, and nothing else, that we are at issue. It is a principle of political expediency. Your Act of 1767 asserts that it is expedient to raise a revenue in America; your Act of 1769 [March 1770], which takes away that revenue, contradicts the Act of 1767; and, by something much stronger than words, asserts that it is not expedient. It is a reflection upon your wisdom to persist in a solemn parliamentary declaration of the expediency of any object, for which, at the same time, you make no sort of provision. And pray, sir, let not this circumstance escape you —it is very material—that the preamble of this Act, which we wish to repeal, is not declaratory of a right, as some gentlemen seem to argue it; it is only a recital of the expediency of a certain exercise of a right supposed already to have been asserted; an exercise you are now contending for by ways and means, which you confess, though they were obeyed, to be utterly insufficient for their purpose. You are, therefore, at this moment in the awkward situation of fighting for a phantom—a quiddity—a thing that wants not only a substance, but even a name; for a thing which is neither abstract right nor profitable enjoyment.

(4.) They tell you, sir, that your *dignity* is tied to it. I know not how it happens, but this dignity of yours is a terrible encumbrance to you, for it has of late been at war with your interest, your equity, and every idea of your policy. Show the thing you contend for to be reason; show it to be common sense; show it to be the means of attaining some useful end; and then I am content to allow it what dignity you please. But what dignity is derived from the perseverance in absurdity, is more than ever I could discern. The honourable gentleman has said well—indeed, in most of his general observations I agree with him—he says that this subject does not stand as it did formerly. Oh, certainly not; every hour you continue on this ill-chosen ground, your difficulties thicken on you; and, therefore, my conclusion is, remove from a bad position as quickly as you can. The disgrace, and the necessity of yielding, both of them, grow upon you every hour of your delay.

But will you repeal the Act, says the honourable gentleman, at this instant, when America is in open resistance to your authority, and that you have just revived your system of taxation? He thinks he has driven us into a corner. But thus pent up, I am content to meet him, because I enter the lists supported by my old authority, his new friends, the ministers themselves. The honourable gentleman remembers that about five years ago as great disturbances as the present prevailed in America on account of the new taxes. The ministers represented these disturbances as treasonable; and this House thought proper, on that representation, to make a famous address for a revival, and for a new application of a statute of Henry VIII. We besought the king, in that *well-considered* address, to inquire into treasons, and to bring the supposed traitors from America to Great Britain for trial. His Majesty was pleased graciously to promise a compliance with our request. All the attempts from this side of the House to resist these violences, and to bring about a repeal, were treated with the utmost scorn. An apprehension of the very consequences now stated by the honourable gentleman was then given as a reason for shutting the door against all hope of such an alteration. And so strong was the spirit for supporting the new taxes, that the session concluded with the following remarkable declaration. After stating the vigorous measures which had been pursued, the speech from the throne proceeds:

"You have assured me of your firm support in the prosecution of them. Nothing, in my opinion, could be more likely to enable the well-disposed among my subjects in that part of the world effectually to discourage and defeat the

designs of the factious and seditious, than the hearty concurrence of every branch of the legislature in maintaining the execution of the laws in every part of my dominions."

After this, no man dreamed that a repeal under this ministry could possibly take place. The honourable gentleman knows as well as I that the idea was utterly exploded by those who sway the House. This speech was made on the 9th day of May 1769. Five days after this speech, that is, on the 13th of the same month, the public circular letter, a part of which I am going to read to you, was written by Lord Hillsborough, Secretary of State for the Colonies. After reciting the substance of the king's speech, he goes on thus:

"I can take upon me to assure you, notwithstanding insinuations to the contrary from men with factious and seditious views, that his Majesty's present administration have at no time entertained a design to propose to Parliament to lay any further taxes upon America for the purpose of raising a revenue; and that it is at present their intention to propose, the next session of Parliament, to take off the duties upon glass, paper, and colours, upon consideration of such duties having been laid contrary to the true principles of commerce.

"These have always been, and still are, the sentiments of his Majesty's present servants, and by which their conduct in respect to America has been governed. And his Majesty relies upon your prudence and fidelity for such an explanation of his measures as may tend to remove the prejudices which have been excited by the misrepresentations of those who are enemies to the peace and prosperity of Great Britain and her colonies, and to re-establish that mutual confidence and affection upon which the glory and safety of the British empire depend."

Here, sir, is a canonical book of ministerial scripture—the General Epistle to the Americans. What does the gentleman say to it? Here a repeal is promised; promised without condition, and while your authority was actually resisted. I pass by the public promise of a peer relative to the repeal of taxes by this House. I pass by the use of the king's name in a matter of supply—that sacred and reserved right of the Commons. I conceal the ridiculous figure of Parliament, hurling its thunders at the gigantic rebellion of America, and then, five days after, prostrate at the feet of those assemblies we affected to despise, begging them, by the intervention of our ministerial sureties, to receive our submission, and heartily promising amendment. These might have been serious matters formerly; but we are grown wiser than our fathers. Passing, therefore, from the constitutional consideration to the mere policy, does not this letter imply that the idea of taxing America for the purpose of revenue is an abominable project, when the ministry suppose none but factious men, and with seditious views, could charge them with it? Does not this letter adopt and sanctify the American distinction of taxing for a revenue? Does it not state the ministerial rejection of such principle of taxation, not as the occasional, but the constant opinion of the king's servants? Does it not say—I care not how consistently—but does it not say that their conduct with regard to America has been always governed by this policy? It goes a great deal further. These excellent and trusty servants of the king, justly fearful lest they themselves should have lost all credit with the world, bring out the image of their gracious sovereign from the inmost and most sacred shrine, and they pawn him as a security for their promises. "His Majesty relies on your prudence and fidelity for such an explanation of his measures." These sentiments of the minister, and these measures of his Majesty, can only relate to the principle and practice of taxing for a revenue; and, accordingly, Lord Botetourt, stating it as such, did, with great propriety, and in the exact spirit of his instructions, endeavour to remove the fears of the Virginian Assembly, lest the sentiments, which it seems (unknown to the world) had always been those of the ministers, and by which their conduct in respect to America had been governed, should, by some possible revolution, favourable to wicked American taxers, be hereafter counteracted. He addresses them in this manner:

"It may possibly be objected that, as his Majesty's present administration are not immortal, their successors may be inclined to attempt to undo what the present ministers shall have attempted to perform; and to that objection I can give but this answer: that it is my firm opinion that the plan I have stated to you will certainly take place, and that it will never be departed from; and so determined am I for ever to abide by it, that I will be content to be declared infamous if I do not, to the last hour of my life, at all times, in all places, and upon all occasions, exert every power with which I either am or ever shall be legally invested, in order to obtain and maintain for the continent of America that satisfaction which I have been authorised to promise this day, by the confidential servants of our gracious sovereign, who, to my certain knowledge, rates his honour so high that he would rather part with his crown than preserve it by deceit." *

* "A material point is omitted by Mr Burke in this speech, viz., the manner in which the Americans received this royal assurance. The Assembly of Virginia, in their address in answer to Lord Botetourt's speech, express themselves thus: 'We will not suffer our present hopes, arising from the pleasing prospect your lordship hath so kindly opened and displayed to us, to be dashed by the bitter reflection that any future administration will entertain a wish to depart from that plan which affords the surest and most

A glorious and true character! which (since we suffer his ministers with impunity to answer for his ideas of taxation) we ought to make it our business to enable his Majesty to preserve in all its lustre. Let him have character, since ours is no more! Let some part of government be kept in respect!

This epistle is not the letter of Lord Hillsborough solely, though he held the official pen. It was the letter of the noble lord upon the floor [Lord North], and of all the king's then ministers, who (with, I think, the exception of two only) are his ministers at this hour. The very first news that a British Parliament heard of what it was to do with the duties which it had given and granted to the king, was by the publication of the votes of American assemblies. It was in America that your resolutions were predeclared. It was from thence that we knew to a certainty how much exactly, and not a scruple more or less, we were to repeal. We were unworthy to be let into the secret of our own conduct. The assemblies had confidential communications from his Majesty's confidential servants. We were nothing but instruments. Do you, after this, wonder that you have no weight and no respect in the colonies? After this, are you surprised that Parliament is every day and everywhere losing (I feel it with sorrow, I utter it with reluctance) that reverential affection which so endearing a name of authority ought ever to carry with it; that you are obeyed solely from respect to the bayonet; and that this House, the ground and pillar of freedom, is itself held up only by the treacherous underpinning and clumsy buttresses of arbitrary power?

If this dignity, which is to stand in the place of just policy and common sense, had been consulted, there was a time for preserving it, and for reconciling it with any concession. If, in the session of 1768, that session of idle terror and empty menaces, you had, as you were often pressed to do, repealed those taxes, then your strong operations would have come justified and enforced, in case your concessions had been returned by outrages. But, preposterously, you began with violence, and before terrors could have any effect, either good or bad, your ministers immediately begged pardon, and promised that repeal to the obstinate Americans which they had refused in an easy, good-natured, complying British Parliament. The assemblies, which had been publicly and avowedly dissolved for their contumacy, are called together to receive your submission. Your ministerial directors blustered like tragic tyrants here; and then went mumping with a sore leg in America, canting, and whining, and complaining of faction, which represented them as friends to a revenue from the colonies. I hope nobody in this House will hereafter have the impudence to defend American taxes in the name of ministry. The moment they do, with this letter of attorney in my hand, I will tell them, in the authorised terms, they are wretches, "with factious and seditious views; enemies to the peace and prosperity of the mother country and the colonies," and subverters "of the mutual affection and confidence on which the glory and safety of the British empire depend."

After this letter, the question is no more on propriety or dignity. They are gone already. The faith of your sovereign is pledged for the political principle. The general declaration in the letter goes to the whole of it. You must therefore either abandon the scheme of taxing, or you must send the ministers tarred and feathered to America, who dared to hold out the royal faith for a renunciation of all taxes for revenue. Them you must punish, or this faith you must preserve. The preservation of this faith is of more consequence than the duties on red lead, or white lead, or on broken glass, or atlas ordinary, or demy fine, or blue royal, or bastard, or foolscap, which you have given up, or the threepence on tea which you have retained. The letter went stamped with the public authority of this kingdom. The instructions for the colony government go under no other sanction; and America cannot believe, and will not obey you, if you do not preserve this channel of communication sacred. You are now punishing the colonies for acting on distinctions held out by that very ministry which is here shining in riches, in favour, and in power, and urging the punishment of the very offence to which they had themselves been the tempters.

Sir, if reasons respecting simply your own commerce, which is your own convenience, were the sole grounds of the repeal of the five duties, why does Lord Hillsborough, in disclaiming in the name of the king and ministry their ever having had an intent to tax for revenue, mention it as the means of "re-establishing the confidence and affection of the colonies?" Is it a way of soothing others to assure them that you will take good care of yourself? The medium, the only medium, for regaining their affection and confidence is, that you will take off something oppressive to their minds. Sir, the letter strongly enforces that idea; for, though the repeal of the taxes is promised on commercial principles, yet the means of counteracting "the insinuations of men with factious and seditious views," is by a disclaimer of *the intention of taxing for* REVENUE, as a constant invariable

---

permanent foundation of public tranquillity and happiness. No, my lord, we are sure our most gracious sovereign, under whatever changes may happen in his confidential servants, will remain immutable in the ways of truth and justice, and that he is incapable of deceiving his faithful subjects; and we esteem your lordship's information not only as warranted, but even sanctified by the royal word.'"—*Goodrich's British Eloquence.*

sentiment and rule of conduct in the government of America.

I remember that the noble lord [Lord North] on the floor—not in a former debate, to be sure (it would be disorderly to refer to it—I suppose I read it somewhere)—but the noble lord was pleased to say that he did not conceive how it could enter into the head of man to impose such taxes as those of 1767 (I mean those taxes which *he* voted for imposing and voted for repealing), as being taxes, contrary to all the principles of commerce, laid on British manufactures.

I daresay the noble lord is perfectly well read, because the duty of his particular office requires he should be so, in all our revenue laws, and in the policy which is to be collected out of them. Now, sir, when he had read this Act of American revenue, and a little recovered from his astonishment, I suppose he made one step retrograde (it is but one), and looked at the Act which stands just before in the statute-book. The American revenue is the forty-fifth chapter; the other to which I refer is the forty-fourth of the same session. These two Acts are both to the same purpose; both revenue Acts, both taxing out of the kingdom, and both taxing British manufactures exported. As the forty-fifth is an Act for raising a revenue in America, the forty-fourth is an Act for raising a revenue in the Isle of Man. The two Acts perfectly agree in all respects except one. In the Act for taxing the Isle of Man, the noble lord will find (not, as in the American Act, four or five articles, but) almost the whole body of British manufactures taxed from two and a half to fifteen per cent., and some articles, such as that of spirits, a great deal higher. You did not think it uncommercial to tax the whole mass of your manufactures, and, let me add, your agriculture too; for, I now recollect, British corn is there also taxed up to ten per cent., and this, too, in the very headquarters, the very citadel of smuggling, the Isle of Man. Now, will the noble lord condescend to tell me why he repealed the taxes on your manufactures sent out to America, and not the taxes on the manufactures exported to the Isle of Man? The principle was exactly the same, the objects charged infinitely more extensive, the duties without comparison higher. Why? why, notwithstanding all his childish pretexts, *because the taxes were quietly submitted to in the Isle of Man; and because they raised a flame in America.* Your reasons were political, not commercial. The repeal was made, as Lord Hillsborough's letter well expresses it, to regain "the confidence and affection of the colonies, on which the glory and safety of the British empire depend." A wise and just motive surely, if ever there was such. But the mischief and dishonour is, that you have not done what you had given the colonies just cause to expect, when your ministers disclaimed the idea of taxes for a revenue. There is nothing simple, nothing manly, nothing ingenuous, open, decisive, or steady in the proceeding, with regard either to the continuance or the repeal of the taxes. The whole has an air of littleness and fraud. The article of tea is slurred over in the circular letter, as it were by accident. Nothing is said of a resolution either to keep that tax or to give it up. There is no fair dealing in any part of the transaction.

If you mean to follow your true motive and your public faith, give up your tax on tea for raising a revenue, the principle of which has, in effect, been disclaimed in your name, and which produces you no advantage—no, not a penny. Or, if you choose to go on with a poor pretence instead of a solid reason, and will still adhere to your cant of commerce, you have ten thousand times more strong commercial reasons for giving up this duty on tea than for abandoning the five others that you have already renounced.

The American consumption of teas is annually, I believe, worth £300,000, at the least farthing. If you urge the American violence as a justification of your perseverance in enforcing this tax, you know that you can never answer this plain question, "Why did you repeal the others given in the same Act, while the very same violence subsisted?" But you did not find the violence cease upon that concession? No! because the concession was far short of satisfying the principle which Lord Hillsborough had abjured, or even the pretence on which the repeal of the other taxes was announced; and because, by enabling the East India Company to open a shop for defeating the American resolution not to pay that specific tax, you manifestly showed a hankering after the principle of the Act which you formerly had renounced. Whatever road you take leads to a compliance with this motion. It opens to you at the end of every vista. Your commerce, your policy, your promises, your reasons, your pretences, your consistency, your inconsistency—all jointly oblige you to this repeal.

But still it sticks in our throats. If we go so far, the Americans will go further. We do not know that. We ought, from experience, rather to presume the contrary. Do we not know for certain that the Americans are going on as fast as possible, while we refuse to gratify them? Can they do more, or can they do worse, if we yield this point? I think this concession will rather fix a turnpike to prevent their further progress. It is impossible to answer for bodies of men. But I am sure the natural effect of fidelity, clemency, kindness, in governors, is peace, goodwill, order, and esteem, on the part of the governed. I would certainly, at least, give these fair principles a fair trial, which, since the making of this Act to this hour, they never have had.

II. Sir, the honourable gentleman having

spoken what he thought necessary upon the narrow part of the subject, I have given him, I hope, a satisfactory answer. He next presses me, by a variety of direct challenges and oblique reflections, to say something on the HISTORICAL PART. I shall therefore, sir, open myself fully on that important and delicate subject; not for the sake of telling you a long story (which I know, Mr Speaker, you are not particularly fond of), but for the sake of the weighty instruction that, I flatter myself, will necessarily result from it. It shall not be longer, if I can help it, than so serious a matter requires.

(1.) Permit me then, sir, to lead your attention very far back—back to the Act of Navigation—the corner-stone of the policy of this country with regard to its colonies. Sir, that policy was, from the beginning, purely commercial; and the commercial system was wholly restrictive. It was the system of a monopoly. No trade was let loose from that constraint, but merely to enable the colonists to dispose of what, in the course of your trade, you could not take; or to enable them to dispose of such articles as we forced upon them, and for which, without some degree of liberty, they could not pay. Hence all your specific and detailed enumerations; hence the innumerable checks and counterchecks; hence that infinite variety of paper chains by which you bind together this complicated system of the colonies. This principle of commercial monopoly runs through no less than twenty-nine Acts of Parliament, from the year 1660 to the unfortunate period of 1764.

In all those Acts the system of commerce is established, as that from whence alone you proposed to make the colonies contribute (I mean directly and by the operation of your superintending legislative power) to the strength of the empire. I venture to say, that during that whole period, a Parliamentary revenue from thence was never once in contemplation. Accordingly, in all the number of laws passed with regard to the plantations, the words which distinguish revenue laws, specifically as such, were, I think, premeditatedly avoided. I do not say, sir, that a form of words alters the nature of the law, or abridges the power of the lawgiver. It certainly does not. However, titles and former preambles are not always idle words; and the lawyers frequently argue from them. I state these facts to show, not what was your right, but what has been your settled policy. Our revenue laws have usually a *title*, purporting their being *grants;* and the words *give and grant* usually precede the enacting parts. Although duties were imposed on America in Acts of King Charles II., and in Acts of King William, no one title of giving "an aid to his Majesty," or any of the usual titles to revenue Acts, was to be found in any of them till 1764; nor were the words "give and grant" in any preamble until the 6th of George II. However, the title of this Act of George II., notwithstanding the words of donation, considers it merely as a regulation—"An Act for the better securing of the trade of his Majesty's sugar colonies in America." This Act was made on a compromise of all, at the express desire of a part of the colonies themselves. It was therefore in some measure with their consent; and having a title directly purporting only a *commercial regulation*, and being in truth nothing more, the words were passed by, at a time when no jealousy was entertained and things were little scrutinised. Even Governor Bernard, in his second printed letter, dated in 1763, gives it as his opinion, that "it was an Act of *prohibition*, not of revenue." This is certainly true, that no Act avowedly for the purpose of revenue, and with the ordinary title and recital taken together, is found in the statute-book until the year I have mentioned, that is, the year 1764. All before this period stood on commercial regulation and restraint. The scheme of a colony revenue by British authority appeared therefore to the Americans in the light of a great innovation; the words of Governor Bernard's ninth letter, written in November 1765, state this idea very strongly; "it must," says he, "have been supposed, such *an innovation* as a Parliamentary taxation would cause a great alarm, and meet with much opposition in most parts of America. It was quite *new* to the people, and had no *visible bounds* set to it." After stating the weakness of government there, he says, "Was this a time to introduce so great a novelty as a Parliamentary inland taxation in America?" Whatever the right might have been, this mode of using it was absolutely new in policy and practice.

Sir, they who are friends to the schemes of American revenue say that the commercial restraint is full as hard a law for America to live under. I think so too. I think it, if uncompensated, to be a condition of as rigorous servitude as men can be subject to. But America bore it from the fundamental Act of Navigation until 1764. Why? Because men do bear the inevitable constitution of their original nature with all its infirmities. The Act of Navigation attended the colonies from their infancy, grew with their growth, and strengthened with their strength. They were confirmed in obedience to it, even more by usage than by law. They scarcely had remembered a time when they were not subject to such restraint. Besides, they were indemnified for it by a pecuniary compensation. Their monopolist happened to be one of the richest men in the world. By his immense capital (primarily employed, not for their benefit, but his own), they were enabled to proceed with their fisheries, their agriculture, their shipbuilding, and their trade too, within the limits, in such a manner as got far the start of the slow, languid operations of unassisted nature. This capital was a hot-bed to them. Nothing in the

history of mankind is like their progress. For my part, I never cast an eye on their flourishing commerce, and their cultivated and commodious life, but they seem to me rather ancient nations grown to perfection through a long series of fortunate events, and a train of successful industry, accumulating wealth in many centuries, than the colonies of yesterday—than a set of miserable outcasts, a few years ago, not so much sent as thrown out, on the bleak and barren shore of a desolate wilderness three thousand miles from all civilised intercourse.

All this was done by England, while England pursued trade and forgot revenue. You not only acquired commerce, but you actually created the very objects of trade in America; and by that creation you raised the trade of this kingdom at least fourfold. America had the compensation of your capital, which made her bear her servitude. She had another compensation, which you are now going to take away from her. She had, except the commercial restraint, every characteristic mark of a free people in all her internal concerns. She had the image of the British constitution. She had the substance. She was taxed by her own representatives. She chose most of her own magistrates. She paid them all. She had, in effect, the sole disposal of her own internal government. This whole state of commercial servitude and civil liberty, taken together, is certainly not perfect freedom; but, comparing it with the ordinary circumstances of human nature, it was a happy and a liberal condition.

I know, sir, that great and not unsuccessful pains have been taken to inflame our minds by an outcry, in this House, and out of it, that in America the Act of Navigation neither is, nor ever was obeyed. But if you take the colonies through, I affirm that its authority never was disputed; that it was nowhere disputed for any length of time; and, on the whole, that it was well observed. Wherever the Act pressed hard, many individuals indeed evaded it. This is nothing. These scattered individuals never denied the law, and never obeyed it. Just as it happens whenever the laws of trade, whenever the laws of revenue, press hard upon the people in England; in that case all your shores are full of contraband. Your right to give a monopoly to the East India Company, your right to lay immense duties on French brandy, are not disputed in England. You do not make this charge on any man. But you know that there is not a creek from Pentland Firth to the Isle of Wight, in which they do not smuggle immense quantities of teas, East India goods, and brandies. I take it for granted that the authority of Governor Bernard on this point is indisputable. Speaking of these laws, as they regarded that part of America now in so unhappy a condition, he says, "I believe they are nowhere better supported than in this province. I do not pretend that it is entirely free from a breach of these laws; but that such a breach, if discovered, is justly punished." What more can you say of the obedience to any laws in any country? An obedience to these laws formed the acknowledgment, instituted by yourselves, for your superiority, and was the payment you originally imposed for your protection.

Whether you were right or wrong in establishing the colonies on the principles of commercial monopoly, rather than on that of revenue, is at this day a problem of mere speculation. You cannot have both by the same authority. To join together the restraints of a universal internal and external monopoly with a universal internal and external taxation, is an unnatural union—perfect uncompensated slavery. You have long since decided for yourself and them; and you and they have prospered exceedingly under that decision.

(2.) This nation, sir, never thought of departing from that choice until the period immediately on the close of the last war. Then a scheme of government new in many things seemed to have been adopted. I saw, or thought I saw, several symptoms of a great change, while I sat in your gallery, a good while before I had the honour of a seat in this House. At that period the necessity was established of keeping up no less than twenty new regiments, with twenty colonels capable of seats in this House. This scheme was adopted with very general applause from all sides, at the very time that, by your conquests in America, your danger from foreign attempts in that part of the world was much lessened, or, indeed, rather quite over. When this huge increase of military establishment was resolved on, a revenue was to be found to support so great a burden. Country gentlemen, the great patrons of economy, and the great resisters of a standing armed force, would not have entered with much alacrity into the vote for so large and expensive an army, if they had been very sure that they were to continue to pay for it. But hopes of another kind were held out to them; and in particular, I well remember that Mr Townsend, in a brilliant harangue on this subject, did dazzle them, by playing before their eyes the image of a revenue to be raised in America.

Here began to dawn the first glimmerings of this new colony system. It appeared more distinctly afterward, when it was devolved upon a person [Mr Grenville] to whom, on other accounts, this country owes very great obligations. I do believe that he had a very serious desire to benefit the public. But with no small study of the detail, he did not seem to have his view, at least equally, carried to the total circuit of our affairs. He generally considered his objects in lights that were rather too detached. Whether the business of an American revenue was imposed upon him altogether; whether it was entirely the result of his own speculation; or, what

is more probable, that his own ideas rather coincided with the instructions he had received, certain it is, that, with the best intentions in the world, he first brought this fatal scheme into form, and established it by Act of Parliament.

No man can believe that at this time of day I mean to lean on the venerable memory of a great man, whose loss we deplore in common. Our little party differences have been long ago composed; and I have acted more with him, and certainly with more pleasure with him, than ever I acted against him. Undoubtedly Mr Grenville was a first-rate figure in this country. With a masculine understanding, and a stout and resolute heart, he had an application undissipated and unwearied. He took public business, not as a duty which he was to fulfil, but as a pleasure he was to enjoy; and he seemed to have no delight out of this House, except in such things as in some way related to the business that was to be done within it. If he was ambitious, I will say this for him, his ambition was of a noble and generous strain. It was to raise himself, not by the low, pimping politics of a court, but to win his way to power through the laborious gradations of public service, and to secure himself a well-earned rank in Parliament by a thorough knowledge of its constitution, and a perfect practice in all its business.

Sir, if such a man fell into errors, it must be from defects not intrinsical; they must be rather sought in the particular habits of his life, which, though they do not alter the groundwork of character, yet tinge it with their own hue. He was bred in a profession. He was bred to the law, which is, in my opinion, one of the first and noblest of human sciences—a science which does more to quicken and invigorate the understanding than all the other kinds of learning put together; but it is not apt, except in persons very happily born, to open and to liberalise the mind exactly in the same proportion. Passing from that study, he did not go very largely into the world, but plunged into business; I mean, into the business of office, and the limited and fixed methods and forms established there. Much knowledge is to be had undoubtedly in that line; and there is no knowledge which is not valuable. But it may be truly said that men too much conversant in office are rarely minds of remarkable enlargement. Their habits of office are apt to give them a turn to think the substance of business not to be much more important than the forms in which it is conducted. These forms are adapted to ordinary occasions; and, therefore, persons who are nurtured in office do admirably well, as long as things go on in their common order; but when the high roads are broken up, and the waters out, when a new and troubled scene is opened, and the file affords no precedent, then it is that a greater knowledge of mankind, and a far more extensive comprehension of things, is requisite than ever office gave, or than office can ever give. Mr Grenville thought better of the wisdom and power of human legislation than in truth it deserves. He conceived, and many conceived along with him, that the flourishing trade of this country was greatly owing to law and institution, and not quite so much to liberty; for but too many are apt to believe regulation to be commerce, and taxes to be revenue. Among regulations, that which stood first in reputation was his idol. I mean the Act of Navigation. He has often professed it to be so. The policy of that Act is, I readily admit, in many respects well understood. But I do say, that if the Act be suffered to run the full length of its principle, and is not changed and modified according to the change of times and the fluctuation of circumstances, it must do great mischief, and frequently even defeat its own purpose.

After the [French] war, and in the last years of it, the trade of America had increased far beyond the speculations of the most sanguine imaginations. It swelled out on every side. It filled all its proper channels to the brim. It overflowed with a rich redundance, and, breaking its banks on the right and on the left, it spread out upon some places where it was indeed improper, upon others where it was only irregular. It is the nature of all greatness not to be exact; and great trade will always be attended with considerable abuses. The contraband will always keep pace in some measure with the fair trade. It should stand as a fundamental maxim, that no vulgar precaution ought to be employed in the cure of evils which are closely connected with the cause of our prosperity. Perhaps this great person turned his eye somewhat less than was just toward the incredible increase of the fair trade, and looked with something of too exquisite a jealousy toward the contraband. He certainly felt a singular degree of anxiety on the subject, and even began to act from that passion earlier than is commonly imagined. For, while he was First Lord of the Admiralty, though not strictly called upon in his official line, he presented a very strong memorial to the Lords of the Treasury (my Lord Bute was then at the head of the board), heavily complaining of the growth of the illicit commerce in America. Some mischief happened even at that time from this over-earnest zeal. Much greater happened afterward, when it operated with greater power in the highest department of the finances. The bonds of the Act of Navigation were straitened so much, that America was on the point of having no trade, either contraband or legitimate. They found, under the construction and execution then used, the Act no longer tying, but actually strangling them. All this coming with new enumerations of commodities; with regulations which in a manner put a stop to the mutual coasting intercourse of the colonies; with the appointment of Courts of

Admiralty under various improper circumstances; with a sudden extinction of the paper currencies; with a compulsory provision for the quartering of soldiers, the people of America thought themselves proceeded against as delinquents, or at best as people under suspicion of delinquency, and in such a manner as they imagined their recent services in the war did not at all merit. Any of these innumerable regulations, perhaps, would not have alarmed alone; some might be thought reasonable; the multitude struck them with terror.

But the grand manœuvre in that business of new regulating the colonies was the 15th Act of the fourth of George III., which, besides containing several of the matters to which I have just alluded, opened a new principle; and here properly began the second period of the policy of this country with regard to the colonies, by which the scheme of a regular plantation Parliamentary revenue was adopted in theory and settled in practice. A revenue, not substituted in the place of, but superadded to a monopoly; which monopoly was enforced at the same time with additional strictness, and the execution put into military hands.

This Act, sir, had for the first time the title of "granting duties in the colonies and plantations of America;" and for the first time it was asserted in the preamble, "that it was *just* and *necessary* that a revenue should be raised there." Then came the technical words of "giving and granting;" and thus a complete American revenue Act was made in all the forms, and with a full avowal of the right, equity, policy, and even necessity of taxing the colonies, without any formal consent of theirs. There are contained also in the preamble to that Act these very remarkable words: the Commons, etc., "being desirous to make *some* provision in the *present* session of Parliament *toward* raising the said revenue." By these words it appeared to the colonies that this Act was but a beginning of sorrows; that every session was to produce something of the same kind; that we were to go on from day to day, in charging them with such taxes as we pleased, for such a military force as we should think proper. Had this plan been pursued, it was evident that the provincial assemblies, in which the Americans felt all their portion of importance, and beheld their sole image of freedom, were *ipso facto* annihilated. This ill prospect before them seemed to be boundless in extent, and endless in duration. Sir, they were not mistaken. The ministry valued themselves when this Act passed, and when they gave notice of the Stamp Act, that both of the duties came very short of their ideas of American taxation. Great was the applause of this measure here. In England we cried out for new taxes on America, while they cried out that they were nearly crushed with those which the war and their own grants had brought upon them.

Sir, it has been said in the debate, that when the first American revenue Act (the Act in 1764, imposing the port duties) passed, the Americans did not object to the principle.* It is true they touched it but very tenderly. It was not a direct attack. They were, it is true, as yet novices; as yet unaccustomed to direct attacks upon any of the rights of Parliament. The duties were port duties, like those they had been accustomed to bear, with this difference, that the title was not the same, the preamble not the same, and the spirit altogether unlike. But of what service is this observation to the cause of those that make it? It is a full refutation of the pretence for their present cruelty to America; for it shows, out of their own mouths, that our colonies were backward to enter into the present vexatious and ruinous controversy.

There is also another circulation abroad (spread with a malignant intention, which I cannot attribute to those who say the same thing in this House), that Mr Grenville gave the colony agents an option for their assemblies to tax themselves, which they had refused. I find that much stress is laid on this as a fact. However, it happens neither to be true nor possible. I will observe, first, that Mr Grenville never thought fit to make this apology for himself in the innumerable debates that were had upon the subject. He might have proposed to the colony agents that they should agree in some mode of taxation as the ground of an Act of Parliament, but he never could have proposed that they should tax themselves on requisition, which is the assertion of the day. Indeed, Mr Grenville well knew that the colony agents could have no general powers to consent to it; and they had no time to consult their assemblies for particular powers before he passed his first revenue Act. If you compare dates, you will find it impossible. Burdened as

* With reference to the above, Mr Goodrich remarks in his "Select British Eloquence," that "it is far from being true that 'the Americans did not object to the principle' of the Act of 1764; nor is Mr Burke correct in saying they 'touched it very tenderly.' The first Act of the British Parliament for the avowed purpose of raising a revenue in America was passed April 5th, 1764. Within a month after the news reached Boston, the General Court of Massachusetts met, and on the 13th of June 1764, addressed a letter to Mr Mauduit, their agent in England, giving him spirited and decisive instructions on the subject. It seems he had misconstrued their silence respecting another law, and had not, therefore, come forward in their behalf against the Act. They say, 'No agent of the province has power to make concessions in any case without express orders; and that the silence of the province should have been imputed to any cause, even to despair, rather than to have been construed into a tacit cession of their rights, or an acknowledgment of a right in Parliament to *impose duties and taxes upon a people who are not represented in the House of Commons*. Remonstrances were also sent unto the House of Commons and to the Privy Council from various parts of the country.'"

the agents knew the colonies were at that time, they could not give the least hope of such grants. His own favourite governor was of opinion that the Americans were not then taxable objects.

"Nor was the time less favourable to the equity of such a taxation. I don't mean to dispute the reasonableness of America contributing to the charges of Great Britain when she is able; nor, I believe, would the Americans themselves have disputed it, at a proper time and season. But it should be considered that the American governments themselves have, in the prosecution of the late war, contracted very large debts, which it will take some years to pay off, and in the meantime occasion very burdensome taxes for that purpose only. For instance, this government, which is as much beforehand as any, raises every year £37,500 sterling for sinking their debt, and must continue it for four years longer at least before it will clear."

These are the words of Governor Bernard's letter to a member of the old ministry, and which he has since printed. Mr Grenville could not have made this proposition to the agents for another reason. He was of opinion, which he has declared in this House a hundred times, that the colonies could not legally grant any revenue to the Crown; and that infinite mischiefs would be the consequence of such a power. When Mr Grenville had passed the first revenue Act, and in the same session had made this House come to a resolution for laying a stamp duty on America, between that time and the passing the Stamp Act into a law, he told a considerable and most respectable merchant, a member of this House, whom I am truly sorry I do not now see in his place, when he represented against this proceeding, that if the stamp duty was disliked, he was willing to exchange it for any other equally productive; but that, if he objected to the Americans being taxed by Parliament, he might save himself the trouble of the discussion, as he was determined on the measure. This is the fact, and, if you please, I will mention a very unquestionable authority for it.

Thus, sir, I have disposed of this falsehood. But falsehood has a perennial spring. It is said that no conjecture could be made of the dislike of the colonies to the principle. This is as untrue as the other. After the resolution of the House, and before the passing of the Stamp Act, the colonies of Massachusetts Bay and New York did send remonstrances, objecting to this mode of Parliamentary taxation. What was the consequence? They were suppressed; they were put under the table—notwithstanding an order of council to the contrary—by the ministry which composed the very council that had made the order; and thus the House proceeded to its business of taxing without the least regular knowledge of the objections which were made to it. But, to give that House its due, it was not over desirous to receive information or to hear remonstrance. On the 15th of February 1765, while the Stamp Act was under deliberation, they refused with scorn even so much as to receive four petitions presented from so respectable colonies as Connecticut, Rhode Island, Virginia, and Carolina, besides one from the traders of Jamaica. As to the colonies, they had no alternative left to them but to disobey, or to pay the taxes imposed by that Parliament which was not suffered, or did not suffer itself, even to hear them remonstrate upon the subject.

(3.) This was the state of the colonies before his Majesty thought fit to change his ministers. It stands upon no authority of mine. It is proved by incontrovertible records. The honourable gentleman has desired some of us to lay our hands upon our hearts, and answer to his queries upon the historical part of this consideration; and by his manner (as well as my eyes could discern it) he seemed to address himself to me.

Sir, I will answer him as clearly as I am able, and with great openness. I have nothing to conceal. In the year '65, being in a very private station, far enough from any line of business, and not having the honour of a seat in this House, it was my fortune, unknowing and unknown to the then ministry, by the intervention of a common friend, to become connected with a very noble person [Lord Rockingham], and at the head of the Treasury department.* It was indeed in a situation of little rank and no consequence, suitable to the mediocrity of my talents and pretensions; but a situation near enough to enable me to see, as well as others, what was going on; and I did see in that noble person such sound principles, such an enlargement of mind, such clear and sagacious sense, and such unshaken fortitude, as have bound me, as well as others much better than me, by an inviolable attachment to him from that time forward. Sir, Lord Rockingham very early in that summer received a strong representation from many weighty English merchants and manufacturers, from governors of provinces and commanders of men-of-war, against almost the whole of the American commercial regulations; and particularly with regard to the total ruin which was threatened to the Spanish trade. I believe, sir, the noble lord soon saw his way in this business. But he did not rashly determine against Acts which it might be supposed were the result of much deliberation. However, sir, he scarcely began to open the ground, when the whole venerable body of office took the alarm. A violent outcry of all (except those who knew and felt the mischief) was raised against any alteration. On one hand, his attempt was a direct violation of treaties and public law. On the other, the Act of Navigation and all the corps of trade laws were drawn up in array against it.

* Burke became private secretary to Lord Rockingham in July 1765.

The first step the noble lord took was to have the opinion of his excellent, learned, and ever-lamented friend, the late Mr Yorke, then Attorney-General, on the point of law. When he knew that formally and officially, which in substance he had known before, he immediately despatched orders to redress the grievance. But I will say it for the then minister, he is of that constitution of mind, that I know he would have issued, on the same critical occasion, the very same orders, if the Acts of trade had been, as they were not, directly against him; and would have cheerfully submitted to the equity of Parliament for his indemnity.

On the conclusion of this business of the Spanish trade, the news of the troubles, on account of the Stamp Act, arrived in England. It was not until the end of October that these accounts were received. No sooner had the sound of that mighty tempest reached us in England, than the whole of the then Opposition, instead of feeling humbled by the unhappy issue of their measures, seemed to be infinitely elated, and cried out that the ministry, from envy to the glory of their predecessors, were prepared to repeal the Stamp Act. Near nine years after, the honourable gentleman takes quite opposite ground, and now challenges me to put my hand to my heart, and say whether the ministry had resolved on the repeal till a considerable time after the meeting of Parliament. Though I do not very well know what the honourable gentleman wishes to infer from the admission or from the denial of this fact, on which he so earnestly adjures me, I do put my hand on my heart, and assure him that they did *not* come to a resolution directly to repeal. They weighed this matter as its difficulty and importance required. They considered maturely among themselves. They consulted with all who could give advice or information. It was not determined until a little before the meeting of Parliament; but it was determined, and the main lines of their own plan marked out, before that meeting. Two questions arose. I hope I am not going into a narrative troublesome to the House.

[A cry of Go on, go on.]

The first of the two considerations was whether the repeal should be total, or whether only partial; taking out everything burdensome and productive, and reserving only an empty acknowledgment, such as a stamp on cards or dice. The other question was, on what principle the Act should be repealed. On this head, also, two principles were started: one, that the legislative rights of this country, with regard to America, were not entire, but had certain restrictions and limitations. The other principle was, that taxes of this kind were contrary to the fundamental principles of commerce on which the colonies were founded, and contrary to every idea of political equity; by which equity we are bound as much as possible to extend the spirit and benefit of the British constitution to every part of the British dominions. The option, both of the measure and of the principle of repeal, was made before the session; and I wonder how any one can read the king's speech at the opening of that session without seeing in that speech both the repeal and the Declaratory Act very sufficiently crayoned out. Those who cannot see this can see nothing.

Surely the honourable gentleman will not think that a great deal less time than was then employed ought to have been spent in deliberation, when he considers that the news of the troubles did not arrive till toward the end of October. The Parliament sat to fill the vacancies on the 14th day of December, and on business the 14th of the following January.

Sir, a partial repeal, or, as the *bon ton* of the Court then was, a *modification*, would have satisfied a timid, unsystematic, procrastinating ministry, as such a measure has since done such a ministry [Lord North's]. A modification is the constant resource of weak, undeciding minds. To repeal by a denial of our right to tax in the preamble (and this, too, did not want advisers), would have cut, in the heroic style, the Gordian knot with a sword. Either measure would have cost no more than a day's debate. But when the total repeal was adopted, and adopted on principles of policy, of equity, and of commerce, this plan made it necessary to enter into many and difficult measures. It became necessary to open a very large field of evidence commensurate to these extensive views. But then this labour did knight's service. It opened the eyes of several to the true state of American affairs; it enlarged their ideas, it removed their prejudices, and it conciliated the opinions and affections of men. The noble lord who then took the lead in the administration, my honourable friend [Mr Dowdeswell] under me, and a right honourable gentleman [General Conway] (if he will not reject his share, and it was a large one, of this business), exerted the most laudable industry in bringing before you the fullest, most impartial, and least garbled body of evidence that was ever produced to this House. I think the inquiry lasted in the committee for six weeks; and, at its conclusion, this House, by an independent, noble, spirited, and unexpected majority—by a majority that will redeem all the acts ever done by majorities in Parliament, in the teeth of all the old mercenary Swiss of state, in despite of all the old speculators and augurs of political events, in defiance of the whole embattled legion of veteran pensioners and practised instruments of a court, gave a total repeal to the Stamp Act, and (if it had been so permitted) a lasting peace to this whole empire.

I state, sir, these particulars, because this act of spirit and fortitude has lately been, in the circulation of the season, and in some hazarded

declamations in this House, attributed to timidity. If, sir, the conduct of ministry, in proposing the repeal, had arisen from timidity with regard to themselves, it would have been greatly to be condemned. Interested timidity disgraces as much in the cabinet as personal timidity does in the field. But timidity, with regard to the well-being of our country, is heroic virtue. The noble lord who then conducted affairs, and his worthy colleagues, while they trembled at the prospect of such distresses as you have since brought upon yourselves, were not afraid steadily to look in the face that glaring and dazzling influence at which the eyes of eagles have blenched. He looked in the face of one of the ablest, and, let me say, not the most scrupulous Oppositions that, perhaps, ever was in this House, and withstood it, unaided by even one of the usual supporters of administration. He did this when he repealed the Stamp Act. He looked in the face of a person he had long respected and regarded, and whose aid was then particularly wanting. I mean Lord Chatham. He did this when he passed the Declaratory Act.*

It is now given out, for the usual purposes, by the usual emissaries, that Lord Rockingham did not consent to the repeal of this Act until he was bullied into it by Lord Chatham; and the reporters have gone so far as publicly to assert, in a hundred companies, that the honourable gentleman under the gallery [General Conway], who proposed the repeal in the American committee, had another set of resolutions in his pocket directly the reverse of those he moved. These artifices of a desperate cause are, at this time, spread abroad with incredible care, in every part of the town, from the highest to the lowest companies; as if the industry of the circulation were to make amends for the absurdity of the report.

Sir, whether the noble lord is of a complexion to be bullied by Lord Chatham, or by any man, I must submit to those who know him. I confess, when I look back at that time, I consider him as placed in one of the most trying situations in which, perhaps, any man ever stood. In the House of Peers there were very few of the ministry, out of the noble lord's particular connection (except Lord Egmont, who acted, as far as I could discern, an honourable and manly part), that did not look to some other future arrangement, which warped his politics. There were in both Houses new and menacing appearances, that might very naturally drive any other than a most resolute minister from his measure or from his station. The household troops openly revolted. The allies of ministry (those, I mean, who supported some of their measures, but refused responsibility for any) endeavoured to undermine their credit, and to take ground that must be fatal to the success of the very cause which they would be thought to countenance. The question of the repeal was brought on by ministry in the committee of this House, in the very instant when it was known that more than one court negotiation was carrying on with the heads of the Opposition. Everything, upon every side, was full of traps and mines. Earth below shook; heaven above menaced; all the elements of ministerial safety were dissolved. It was in the midst of this chaos of plots and counter-plots—it was in the midst of this complicated warfare against public opposition and private treachery, that the firmness of that noble person was put to the proof. He never stirred from his ground—no, not an inch. He remained fixed and determined, in principle, in measure, and in conduct. He practised no managements. He secured no retreat. He sought no apology.

I will likewise do justice—I ought to do it—to the honourable gentleman who led us in this House [General Conway]. Far from the duplicity wickedly charged on him, he acted his part with alacrity and resolution. We all felt inspired by the example he gave us, down even to myself, the weakest in that phalanx. I declare for one, I knew well enough (it could not be concealed from anybody) the true state of things; but, in my life, I never came with so much spirits into this House. It was a time for a *man* to act in. We had powerful enemies, but we had faithful and determined friends, and a glorious cause. We had a great battle to fight, but we had the means of fighting; not as now, when our arms are tied behind us. We did fight that day, and conquer.

I remember, sir, with a melancholy pleasure, the situation of the honourable gentleman [General Conway], who made the motion for the repeal, in that crisis, when the whole trading interest of this empire, crammed into your lobbies, with a trembling and anxious expectation, waited, almost to a winter's return of light, their fate from your resolutions. When, at length, you had determined in their favour, and your doors, thrown open, showed them the figure of their deliverer in the well-earned triumph of his important victory, from the whole of that grave multitude there arose an involuntary burst of gratitude and transport. They jumped upon him like children on a long-absent father. They clung upon him as captives about their redeemer. All England, all America, joined to his applause. Nor did he seem insensible to the best of all earthly rewards, the love and admiration of his fellow-citizens.

"Hope elevated and joy
Brightened his crest."
—*Milton's Par. Lost*, ix. 634.

I stood near him; and his face—to use the expression of the Scripture of the first martyr—"his face was as if it had been the face of an angel." I do not know how others feel, but if I had stood in that situation, I never would have

* *Vide* Pitt's speech on the Stamp Act, p. 139.

exchanged it for all that kings in their profusion could bestow. I did hope that that day's danger and honour would have been a bond to hold us all together for ever. But, alas! that, with other pleasing visions, is long since vanished.

Sir, this act of supreme magnanimity has been represented as if it had been a measure of an administration that, having no scheme of their own, took a middle line, pilfered a bit from one side and a bit from the other. Sir, they took *no* middle lines. They differed fundamentally from the schemes of both parties, but they preserved the objects of both. They preserved the authority of Great Britain. They preserved the equity of Great Britain. They made the Declaratory Act. They repealed the Stamp Act. They did both *fully;* because the Declaratory Act was without qualification, and the repeal of the Stamp Act total. This they did in the situation I have ascribed.

Now, sir, what will the adversary say to both these Acts? If the principle of the Declaratory Act was not good, the principle we are contending for this day is monstrous. If the principle of the repeal was not good, why are we not at war for a real, substantial, effective revenue? If both were bad, why has this ministry incurred all the inconveniences of both and of all schemes? Why have they enacted, repealed, enforced, yielded, and now attempt to enforce again?

Sir, I think I may as well now, as at any other time, speak to a certain matter of fact, not wholly unrelated to the question under your consideration. We, who would persuade you to revert to the ancient policy of this kingdom, labour under the effect of this short current phrase, which the court leaders have given out to all their corps, in order to take away the credit of those who would prevent you from that frantic war you are going to wage upon your colonies. Their cant is this: "All the disturbances in America have been created by the repeal of the Stamp Act." I suppress for a moment my indignation at the falsehood, baseness, and absurdity of this most audacious assertion. Instead of remarking on the motives and character of those who have issued it for circulation, I will clearly lay before you the state of America, antecedently to that repeal, after the repeal, and since the renewal of the schemes of American taxation.

It is said that the disturbances, if there were any before the repeal, were slight, and without difficulty or inconvenience might have been suppressed. For an answer to this assertion I will send you to the great author and patron of the Stamp Act, who, certainly meaning well to the authority of this country, and fully apprised of the state of that, made, before a repeal was so much as agitated in this House, the motion which is on your journals; and which, to save the clerk the trouble of turning to it, I will now read to you. It was for an amendment to the address of the 17th of December 1765.

"To express our just resentment and indignation at the outrageous tumults and insurrections which have been excited and carried on in North America; and at the resistance given by open and rebellious force to the execution of the laws in that part of his Majesty's dominions; and to assure his Majesty that his faithful Commons, animated with the warmest duty and attachment to his royal person and government, will firmly and effectually support his Majesty in all such measures as shall be necessary for preserving and supporting the legal dependence of the colonies on the mother country," etc., etc.

Here was certainly a disturbance preceding the repeal; such a disturbance as Mr Grenville thought necessary to qualify by the name of an insurrection, and the epithet of a rebellious force: terms much stronger than any by which those who then supported his motion have ever since thought proper to distinguish the subsequent disturbances in America. They were disturbances which seemed to him and his friends to justify as strong a promise of support as hath been usual to give in the beginning of a war with the most powerful and declared enemies. When the accounts of the American governors came before the House, they appeared stronger even than the warmth of public imagination had painted them; so much stronger that the papers on your table bear me out in saying that all the late disturbances which have been at one time the minister's motives for the repeal of five out of six of the new court taxes, and are now his pretences for refusing to repeal that sixth, did not amount—why do I compare them? no, not to a tenth part of the tumults and violence which prevailed long before the repeal of that Act.

Ministry cannot refuse the authority of the Commander-in-Chief, General Gage, who, in his letter of the 4th of November, from New York, thus represents the state of things:

"It is difficult to say from the highest to the lowest, who has not been accessory to this insurrection, either by writing or mutual agreements to oppose the Act, by what they are pleased to term all legal opposition to it. Nothing effectually has been proposed either to prevent or quell the tumult. The rest of the provinces are in the same situation as to a positive refusal to take the stamps; and threatening those who shall take them, to plunder and murder them; and this affair stands in all the provinces, that unless the Act, from its own nature, enforce itself, nothing but a very considerable military force can do it."

It is remarkable, sir, that the persons who formerly trumpeted forth the most loudly the violent resolutions of assemblies, the universal insurrections, the seizing and burning the stamped papers, the forcing stamp officers to resign their commissions under the gallows, the rifling and pulling down of the houses of magistrates, and the expulsion from their country of all who

dared to write or speak a single word in defence of the powers of Parliament—these very trumpeters are now the men that represent the whole as a mere trifle, and choose to date all the disturbances from the repeal of the Stamp Act, which put an end to them. Hear your officers abroad, and let them refute this shameless falsehood, who, in all their correspondence, state the disturbances as owing to their true causes, the discontent of the people from the taxes. You have this evidence in your own archives; and it will give you complete satisfaction, if you are not so far lost to all Parliamentary ideas of information as rather to credit the lie of the day than the records of your own House.

Sir, this vermin of court reporters, when they are forced into day upon one point, are sure to burrow in another; but they shall have no refuge; I will make them bolt out of all their holes. Conscious that they must be baffled when they attribute a precedent disturbance to a subsequent measure, they take other ground, almost as absurd, but very common in modern practice, and very wicked; which is to attribute the ill effect of ill-judged conduct to the arguments which had been used to dissuade us from it. They say that the opposition made in Parliament to the Stamp Act, at the time of its passing, encouraged the Americans in their resistance. This has even formally appeared in print in a regular volume from an advocate of that faction, a Dr Tucker. This Dr Tucker is already a dean, and his earnest labours in this vineyard will, I suppose, raise him to a bishopric. But this assertion, too, just like the rest, is false. In all the papers which have loaded your table, in all the vast crowd of verbal witnesses that appeared at your bar—witnesses which were indiscriminately produced from both sides of the House—not the least hint of such a cause of disturbance has ever appeared. As to the fact of a strenuous opposition to the Stamp Act, I sat as a stranger in your gallery when the Act was under consideration. Far from anything inflammatory, I never heard a more languid debate in this House. No more than two or three gentlemen, as I remember, spoke against the Act, and that with great reserve and remarkable temper. There was but one division in the whole progress of the bill; and the minority did not reach to more than thirty-nine or forty. In the House of Lords I do not recollect that there was any debate or division at all. I am sure there was no protest. In fact, the affair passed with so very, very little noise that in town they scarcely knew the nature of what you were doing. The opposition to the bill in England never could have done this mischief, because there scarcely ever was less of opposition to a bill of consequence.

Sir, the agents and distributors of falsehoods have, with their usual industry, circulated another lie of the same nature as the former. It is this, that the disturbances arose from the account which had been received in America of the change in the ministry. No longer awed, it seems, with the spirit of the former rulers, they thought themselves a match for what our calumniators choose to qualify by the name of so feeble a ministry as succeeded. Feeble in one sense these men certainly may be called; for, with all their efforts, and they have made many, they have not been able to resist the distempered vigour and insane alacrity with which you are rushing to your ruin. But it does so happen that the falsity of this circulation is, like the rest, demonstrated by indisputable dates and records.

So little was the change known in America, that the letters of your governors, giving an account of these disturbances long after they had arrived at their highest pitch, were all directed to the *old* ministry, and particularly to the Earl of Halifax, the Secretary of State corresponding with the colonies, without once in the smallest degree intimating the slightest suspicion of any ministerial revolution whatsoever. The ministry was not changed in England until the 10th day of July 1765. On the 14th of the preceding June, Governor Fauquier, from Virginia, writes thus, and writes thus to the Earl of Halifax: "Government is set at defiance, not having strength enough in her hands to enforce obedience to the laws of the country. The private distress which every man feels increases the general dissatisfaction at the duties laid by the Stamp Act, which breaks out and shows itself upon every trifling occasion." The general dissatisfaction had produced some time before, that is, on the 29th of May, several strong public resolves against the Stamp Act; and those resolves are assigned by Governor Bernard as the cause of the insurrections in Massachusetts Bay, in his letter of the 15th of August, still addressed to the Earl of Halifax; and he continued to address such accounts to that minister quite to the 7th of September of the same year. Similar accounts, and of as late a date, were sent from other governors, and all directed to Lord Halifax. Not one of these letters indicates the slightest idea of a change, either known, or even apprehended.

Thus are blown away the insect race of courtly falsehoods! thus perish the miserable inventions of the wretched runners for a wretched cause, which they have flyblown into every weak and rotten part of the country, in vain hopes that when their maggots had taken wing, their importunate buzzing might sound something like the public voice!

Sir, I have troubled you sufficiently with the state of America before the repeal. Now I turn to the honourable gentleman who so stoutly challenges us to tell whether, after the repeal, the provinces were quiet? This is coming home to the point. Here I meet him directly, and answer most readily: *They were quiet.* And I,

in my turn, challenge him to prove when, where, and by whom, and in what numbers, and with what violence, the other laws of trade, as gentlemen assert, were violated in consequence of your concession? or that even your other revenue laws were attacked? But I quit the vantage ground on which I stand, and where I might leave the burden of proof upon him. I walk down upon the open plain, and undertake to show that they were not only quiet, but showed many unequivocal marks of acknowledgment and gratitude. And, to give him every advantage, I select the obnoxious colony of Massachusetts Bay, which at this time (but without hearing her) is so heavily a culprit before Parliament. I will select their proceedings even under circumstances of no small irritation; for, a little imprudently, I must say, Governor Bernard mixed in the administration of the lenitive of the repeal no small acrimony arising from matters of a separate nature. Yet see, sir, the effect of that lenitive, though mixed with these bitter ingredients; and how this rugged people can express themselves on a measure of concession.

"If it is not in our power," say they, in their address to Governor Bernard, "in so full a manner as will be expected, to show our respectful gratitude to the mother country, or to make a dutiful and affectionate return to the indulgence of the king and Parliament, it shall be no fault of ours; for this we intend, and hope we shall be able fully to effect."

Would to God that this temper had been cultivated, managed, and set in action! Other effects than those which we have since felt would have resulted from it. On the requisition for compensation to those who had suffered from the violence of the populace, in the same address they say: "The recommendation enjoined by Mr Secretary Conway's letter, and in consequence thereof made to us, we will embrace the first convenient opportunity to consider and act upon." They did consider; they did act upon it. They obeyed the requisition. I know the mode has been chicaned upon; but it was substantially obeyed, and much better obeyed than I fear the Parliamentary requisition of this session will be, though enforced by all your rigour, and backed with all your power. In a word, the damages of popular fury were compensated by legislative gravity. Almost every other part of America in various ways demonstrated their gratitude. I am bold to say that so sudden a calm recovered after so violent a storm is without parallel in history. To say that no other disturbance should happen from any other cause is folly. But, as far as appearances went, by the judicious sacrifice of one law, you procured an acquiescence in all that remained. After this experience, nobody shall persuade me, when a whole people are concerned, that acts of lenity are not means of conciliation.

I hope the honourable gentleman has received a fair and full answer to his question.

(4.) I have done with the third period of your policy—that of your repeal—and the return of your ancient system, and your ancient tranquillity and concord. Sir, this period was not as long as it was happy. Another scene was opened, and other actors appeared on the stage. The state, in the condition I have described it, was delivered into the hands of Lord Chatham—a great and celebrated name—a name that keeps the name of this country respectable in every other on the globe. It may be truly called—

"Clarum et venerabile nomen,
Gentibus, et multum nostræ quod proderat urbi."

("A name illustrious and revered by nations,
And rich in blessings for our country's good.")
—*Lucan's Pharsalia*, b. ix.

Sir, the venerable age of this great man, his merited rank, his superior eloquence, his splendid qualities, his eminent services, the vast space he fills in the eye of mankind, and, more than all the rest, his fall from power, which, like death, canonises and sanctifies a great character, will not suffer me to censure any part of his conduct. I am afraid to flatter him; I am sure I am not disposed to blame him. Let those who have betrayed him by their adulation, insult him with their malevolence. But what I do not presume to censure, I may have leave to lament. For a wise man, he seemed to me at that time to be governed too much by general maxims. I speak with the freedom of history, and, I hope, without offence. One or two of these maxims, flowing from an opinion not the most indulgent to our unhappy species, and surely a little too general, led him into measures that were greatly mischievous to himself; and, for that reason, among others, perhaps, fatal to his country; measures, the effects of which, I am afraid, are for ever incurable. He made an administration so checkered and speckled; he put together a piece of joinery so crossly indented and whimsically dovetailed; a cabinet so variously inlaid; such a piece of diversified mosaic; such a tesselated pavement without cement; here a bit of black stone, and there a bit of white; patriots and courtiers, king's friends and Republicans, Whigs and Tories, treacherous friends and open enemies; that it was indeed a very curious show, but utterly unsafe to touch, and unsure to stand on. The colleagues whom he had assorted at the same boards, stared at each other, and were obliged to ask, "Sir, your name? Sir, you have the advantage of me—Mr Such-a-one—I beg a thousand pardons." I venture to say, it did so happen, that persons had a single office divided between them, who had never spoken to each other in their lives, until they found themselves, they knew not how, pigging together, heads and points, in the same truckle-bed.*

* Allusion may here be made to the case of the Right

Sir, in consequence of this arrangement, having put so much the larger portion of his enemies and opposers in power, the confusion was such that his own principles could not possibly have any effect or influence in the conduct of affairs. If ever he fell into a fit of the gout, or if any other cause withdrew him from public cares, principles directly the contrary were sure to predominate. When he had executed his plan, he had not an inch of ground to stand upon. When he had accomplished his scheme of administration, he was no longer a minister.

When his face was hid but for a moment, his whole system was on a wide sea, without chart or compass. The gentlemen, his particular friends, who, with the names of various departments of ministry, were admitted to seem as if they acted under him, with a modesty that becomes all men, and with a confidence in him which was justified, even in its extravagance, by his superior abilities, had never, in any instance, presumed upon any opinion of their own.

Deprived of his guiding influence, they were whirled about, the sport of every gust, and easily driven into any port; and as those who joined with them in manning the vessel were the most directly opposite to his opinions, measures, and character, and far the most artful and most powerful of the set, they easily prevailed, so as to seize upon the vacant, unoccupied, and derelict minds of his friends; and instantly they turned the vessel wholly out of the course of his policy. As if it were to insult as well as to betray him, even long before the close of the first session of his administration, when everything was publicly transacted, and with great parade, in his name, they made an Act declaring it highly just and expedient to raise a revenue in America. For even then, sir, even before this splendid orb was entirely set, and while the western horizon was in a blaze with his descending glory, on the opposite quarter of the heavens arose another luminary, and, for his hour, became lord of the ascendant.

This light, too, is passed and set for ever. You understand, to be sure, that I speak of Charles Townsend, officially the reproducer of this fatal scheme, whom I cannot even now remember without some degree of sensibility. In truth, sir, he was the delight and ornament of this House, and the charm of every society which he honoured with his presence. Perhaps there never arose in this country, nor in any country, a man of a more pointed and finished wit, and (where his passions were not concerned) of a more refined, exquisite, and penetrating judgment. If he had not so great a stock as some have had who flourished formerly, of knowledge long treasured up, he knew better by far, than any man I ever was acquainted with, how to bring together within a short time all that was necessary to establish, to illustrate, and to decorate that side of the question he supported. He stated his matter skilfully and powerfully. He particularly excelled in a most luminous explanation and display of his subject. His style of argument was neither trite and vulgar, nor subtle and abstruse. He hit the House just between wind and water; and, not being troubled with too anxious a zeal for any matter in question, he was never more tedious or more earnest than the preconceived opinions and present temper of his hearers required, to whom he was always in perfect unison. He conformed exactly to the temper of the House; and he seemed to guide, because he was always sure to follow it.

I beg pardon, sir, if, when I speak of this and other great men, I appear to digress in saying something of their characters. In this eventful history of the revolutions of America, the characters of such men are of much importance. *Great men are the guide-posts and land-marks in the state.* The credit of such men at court, or in the nation, is the sole cause of all the public measures. It would be an invidious thing (most foreign, I trust, to what you think my disposition) to remark the errors into which the authority of great names has brought the nation, without doing justice at the same time to the great qualities whence that authority arose. The subject is instructive to those who wish to form themselves on whatever of excellence has gone before them. There are many young members in the House (such of late has been the rapid succession of public men) who never saw that prodigy, Charles Townsend, nor, of course, know what a ferment he was able to excite in everything, by the violent ebullition of his mixed virtues and failings. For failings he had, undoubtedly. Many of us remember them. We are this day considering the effect of them. But he had no failings which were not owing to a noble cause—to an ardent, generous, perhaps an immoderate passion for fame—a passion which is the instinct of all great souls. He worshipped that goddess wheresoever she appeared; but he paid his particular devotions to her in her favourite habitation, in her chosen temple, the House of Commons. Besides the characters of the individuals that compose our body, it is impossible, Mr Speaker, not to observe, that this House has a collective character of its own. That character, too, however imperfect, is not unamiable. Like all great public collections of men, you possess a marked love of virtue, and an abhorrence of vice. But among vices, there is none which the House abhors in the same degree with *obstinacy*. Obstinacy, sir, is certainly a great vice; and, in the changeful state of political affairs, it is frequently the cause

Honourable Lord North and George Cooke, Esq., who were made joint paymasters in the summer of 1766, on the removal of the Rockingham administration.

of great mischief. It happens, however, very unfortunately, that almost the whole line of the great and masculine virtues, constancy, gravity, magnanimity, fortitude, fidelity, and firmness, are closely allied to this disagreeable quality, of which you have so just an abhorrence; and, in their excess, all these virtues very easily fall into it. He who paid such a punctilious attention to all your feelings, certainly took care not to shock them by *that* vice which is the most disgustful to you.

That fear of displeasing those who ought most to be pleased, betrayed him sometimes into the other extreme. He had voted, and, in the year 1765, had been an advocate for the Stamp Act. Things and the disposition of men's minds were changed. In short, the Stamp Act began to be no favourite in this House. He therefore attended at the private meeting in which the resolutions moved by a right honourable gentleman were settled—resolutions leading to the repeal. The next day he voted for that repeal—and he would have spoken for it, too, if an illness (not, as was then given out, a political, but, to my knowledge, a very real illness) had not prevented it.

The very next session, as the fashion of this world passeth away, the repeal began to be in as bad an odour in this House as the Stamp Act had been in the session before. To conform to the temper which began to prevail, and to prevail mostly among those most in power, he declared, very early in the winter, that a revenue must be had out of America. Instantly he was tied down to his engagements by some who had no objections to such experiments, when made at the cost of persons for whom they had no particular regard. The whole body of courtiers drove him onward. They always talked as if the king stood in a sort of humiliated state until something of the kind should be done.

Here this extraordinary man, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, found himself in great straits. To please universally was the object of his life: but to tax and to please, no more than to love and to be wise, is not given to men. However, he attempted it. To render the tax palatable to the partisans of American revenue, he made a preamble stating the necessity of such a revenue. To close with the American distinction, this revenue was *external*, or port duty; but again, to soften it to the other party, it was a duty of *supply*. To gratify the *colonists*, it was laid on British manufactures; to satisfy the *merchants of Britain*, the duty was trivial, and, except that on tea, which touched only the devoted East India Company, on none of the grand objects of commerce. To counterwork the American contraband, the duty on tea was reduced from a shilling to threepence. But, to secure the favour of those who would tax America, the scene of collection was changed, and, with the rest, it was levied in the colonies. What need I say more? This fine-spun scheme had the usual fate of all exquisite policy. But the original plan of the duties, and the mode of executing that plan, both arose singly and solely from a love of our applause. He was truly the child of the House. He never thought, did, or said anything, but with a view to you. He every day adapted himself to your disposition, and adjusted himself before it as at a looking-glass.

He had observed (indeed, it could not escape him) that several persons, infinitely his inferiors in all respects, had formerly rendered themselves considerable in this House by one method alone. They were a race of men (I hope in God the species is extinct) who, when they rose in their place, no man living could divine, from any known adherence to parties, to opinions, or to principles, from any order or system in their politics, or from any sequel or connection in their ideas, what part they were going to take in any debate. It is astonishing how much this uncertainty, especially at critical times, called the attention of all parties on such men. All eyes were fixed on them, all ears open to hear them. Each party gaped, and looked alternately for their vote, almost to the end of their speeches. While the House hung in this uncertainty, now the *hear-him's* rose from this side—now they rebellowed from the other; and that party to whom they fell at length from their tremulous and dancing balance, always received them in a tempest of applause. The fortune of such men was a temptation too great to be resisted by one to whom a single whiff of incense withheld gave much greater pain than he received delight in the clouds of it which daily rose about him, from the prodigal superstition of innumerable admirers. He was a candidate for contradictory honours, and his great aim was to make those agree in admiration of him who never agreed in anything else.

Hence arose this unfortunate Act, the subject of this day's debate; from a disposition which, after making an American revenue to please one, repealed it to please others, and again revived it in hopes of pleasing a third, and of catching something in the ideas of all.

(5.) The Revenue Act of 1767 formed the fourth period of American policy. How we have fared since then; what woeful variety of schemes have been adopted; what enforcing and what repealing; what bullying and what submitting; what doing and undoing; what straining and what relaxing; what assemblies dissolved for not obeying, and called again without obedience; what troops sent out to quell resistance, and, on meeting that resistance, recalled; what shiftings, and changes, and jumblings of all kinds of men at home, which left no possibility of order, consistency, vigour, or even so much as a decent unity of colour in any one public measure—it is a tedious, irksome task. My duty may call me to open it out some other time; on a former

occasion I tried your temper on a part of it;* for the present I shall forbear.

After all these changes and agitations, your immediate situation upon the question on your paper is at length brought to this. You have an Act of Parliament, stating that "it is *expedient* to raise a revenue in America." By a partial repeal you annihilated the greatest part of that revenue, which this preamble declares to be so expedient. You have substituted no other in the place of it. A Secretary of State has disclaimed, in the king's name, all thoughts of such a substitution in future. The principle of this disclaimer goes to what has been left as well as what has been repealed. The tax which lingers after its companions (under a preamble declaring an American revenue expedient, and for the sole purpose of supporting the theory of that preamble) militates with the assurance authentically conveyed to the colonies, and is an exhaustless source of jealousy and animosity. On this state, which I take to be a fair one, not being able to discern any grounds of honour, advantage, peace, or power, for adhering either to the Act or to the preamble, I shall vote for the question which leads to the repeal of both.

If you do not fall in with this motion, then secure something to fight for, consistent in theory and valuable in practice. If you must employ your strength, employ it to uphold you in some honourable right or some profitable wrong. If you are apprehensive that the concession recommended to you, though proper, should be a means of drawing on you further but unreasonable claims, why then employ your force in supporting that reasonable concession against those unreasonable demands. You will employ it with more grace, with better effect, and with great probable concurrence of all the quiet and rational people in the provinces, who are now united with and hurried away by the violent; having, indeed, different dispositions, but a common interest. If you apprehend that on a concession you shall be punished by metaphysical process to the extreme lines, and argued out of your whole authority, my advice is this: When you have recovered your old, your strong, your tenable position, then face about—stop short—do nothing more—reason not at all—oppose the ancient policy and practice of the empire as a rampart against the speculations of innovators on both sides of the question, and you will stand on great, manly, and sure ground. On this solid basis fix your machines, and they will draw worlds toward you.

Your ministers, in their own and his Majesty's name, have already adopted the American distinction of internal and external duties. It is a distinction, whatever merit it may have, that was originally moved by the Americans themselves; and I think they will acquiesce in it, if they are not pushed with too much logic and too little sense in all the consequences; that is, if external taxation be understood as they and you understand it when you please to be, not a distinction of geography, but of policy; that it is a power for regulating trade, and not for supporting establishments. The distinction, which is as nothing with regard to right, is of most weighty consideration in practice. Recover your old ground and your old tranquillity. Try it. I am persuaded the Americans will compromise with you. When confidence is once restored, the odious and suspicious *summum jus** will perish of course. The spirit of practicability, of moderation, and mutual convenience, will never call in geometrical exactness as the arbitrator of an amicable settlement. Consult and follow your experience. Let not the long story with which I have exercised your patience prove fruitless to your interests.

For my part, I should choose (if I could have my wish) that the proposition of the honourable gentleman [Mr Fuller] for the repeal could go to America without the attendance of the penal bills. Alone, I could almost answer for its success. I cannot be certain of its reception in the bad company it may keep. In such heterogeneous assortments, the most innocent person will lose the effect of his innocency. Though you should send out this angel of peace, yet you are sending out a destroying angel too; and what would be the effect of the conflict of these two adverse spirits, or which would predominate in the end, is what I dare not say: whether the lenient measures would cause American passion to subside, or the severe would increase its fury. All this is in the hand of Providence. Yet now, even now, I should confide in the prevailing virtue and efficacious operation of lenity, though working in darkness, and in chaos, in the midst of all this unnatural and turbid combination. I should hope it might produce order and beauty in the end.

Let us, sir, embrace some system or other before we end this session. Do you mean to tax America, and to draw a productive revenue from thence? If you do, speak out: name, fix, ascertain this revenue; settle its quantity; define its objects; provide for its collection; and then fight, when you have something to fight for. If you murder, rob! If you kill, take possession; and do not appear in the character of madmen, as well as assassins, violent, vindictive, bloody, and tyrannical, without an object. But may better counsels guide you!

Again and again revert to your old principles. Seek peace and ensue it. Leave America, if she has taxable matter in her, to tax herself. I am

* In moving resolutions regarding the disturbances in America, in May 1770.

* The full quotation being, "Summum jus est summa injuria"—"Right, when pressed to an extreme, becomes the height of injustice."

not here going into the distinctions of rights, nor attempting to mark their boundaries. I do not enter into these metaphysical distinctions. I hate the very sound of them. Leave the Americans as they anciently stood, and these distinctions, born of our unhappy contest, will die along with it. They and we, and their and our ancestors, have been happy under that system. Let the memory of all actions, in contradiction to that good old mode, on both sides be extinguished for ever. Be content to bind America by laws of trade; you have always done it. Let this be your reason for binding their trade. Do not burden them with taxes; you were not used to do so from the beginning. Let this be your reason for not taxing. These are the arguments of states and kingdoms. Leave the rest to the schools, for there only they may be discussed with safety. But if, intemperately, unwisely, fatally, you sophisticate and poison the very source of government, by urging subtle deductions, and consequences odious to those you govern, from the unlimited and illimitable nature of supreme sovereignty, you will teach them by these means to call that sovereignty itself in question. When you drive him hard, the boar will surely turn upon the hunters. If that sovereignty and their freedom cannot be reconciled, which will they take? They will cast your sovereignty in your face. Nobody will be argued into slavery. Sir, let the gentlemen on the other side call forth all their ability; let the best of them get up and tell me what one character of liberty the Americans have, and what one brand of slavery they are free from, if they are bound in their property and industry by all the restraints you can imagine on commerce, and at the same time are made packhorses of every tax you choose to impose, without the least share in granting them? When they bear the burdens of unlimited monopoly, will you bring them to bear the burdens of unlimited revenue too? The Englishman in America will feel that this is slavery—that it is *legal* slavery will be no compensation either to his feelings or his understanding.

A noble lord [Lord Carmarthen], who spoke some time ago, is full of the fire of ingenuous youth; and when he has modelled the ideas of a lively imagination by further experience, he will be an ornament to his country in either House. He has said that the Americans are our children, and how can they revolt against their parent? He says that if they are not free in their present state, England is not free, because Manchester, and other considerable places, are not represented. So, then, because some towns in England are not represented, America is to have no representative at all. They are "our children;" but when children ask for bread, we are not to give a stone. Is it because the natural resistance of things, and the various mutations of time, hinders our government, or any scheme of government, from being any more than a sort of approximation to the right—is it therefore that the colonies are to recede from it infinitely? When this child of ours wishes to assimilate to its parent, and to reflect with a true filial resemblance the beauteous countenance of British liberty, are we to turn to them the shameful parts of our constitution? Are we to give them our weakness for their strength—our opprobrium for their glory; and the slough of slavery, which we are not able to work off, to serve them for their freedom?

If this be the case, ask yourselves this question: Will they be content in such a state of slavery? If not, look to the consequences. Reflect how you ought to govern a people who think they ought to be free, and think they are not. Your scheme yields no revenue; it yields nothing but discontent, disorder, disobedience; and, such is the state of America, that, after wading up to your eyes in blood, you could only end just where you began; that is, to tax where no revenue is to be found; to—my voice fails me; my inclination, indeed, carries me no further—all is confusion beyond it. [Here Mr Burke was compelled by illness to stop for a short time, after which he proceeded:]

Well, sir, I have recovered a little, and, before I sit down, I must say something to another point with which gentlemen urge us: What is to become of the Declaratory Act, asserting the entireness of British legislative authority, if we abandon the practice of taxation?

For my part, I look upon the rights stated in that Act exactly in the manner in which I viewed them on its very first proposition, and which I have often taken the liberty, with great humility, to lay before you. I look, I say, on the imperial rights of Great Britain, and the privileges which the colonists ought to enjoy under these rights, to be just the most reconcilable things in the world. The Parliament of Great Britain sits at the head of her extensive empire in two capacities: one as the local legislature of this island, providing for all things at home, immediately, and by no other instrument than the executive power. The other, and, I think, her nobler capacity, is what I call her imperial character, in which, as from the throne of heaven, she superintends all the several inferior legislatures, and guides and controls them all without annihilating any. As all these provincial legislatures are only co-ordinate to each other, they ought all to be subordinate to her; else they can neither preserve mutual peace, nor hope for mutual justice, nor effectually afford mutual assistance. It is necessary to coerce the negligent, to restrain the violent, and to aid the weak and deficient, by the overruling plenitude of her power. She is never to intrude into the place of others while they are equal to the common ends of their institution. But, in order to enable Parliament to answer all these ends of

provident and beneficient superintendence, her powers must be boundless. The gentlemen who think the powers of Parliament limited may please themselves to talk of requisitions. But suppose the requisitions are not obeyed. What! shall there be no reserved power in the empire to supply a deficiency which may weaken, divide, and dissipate the whole? We are engaged in war; the Secretary of State calls upon the colonies to contribute; some would do it—I think most would cheerfully furnish whatever is demanded; one or two, suppose, hang back, and, easing themselves, let the stress of the draught lie on the others: surely it is proper that some authority might legally say, "Tax yourselves for the common supply, or Parliament will do it for you." This backwardness was, as I am told, actually the case of Pennsylvania for some short time toward the beginning of the last war, owing to some internal dissensions in the colony. But, whether the fact were so or otherwise, the case is equally to be provided for by a competent sovereign power. But then this ought to be no ordinary power, nor ever used in the first instance. This is what I meant when I have said at various times that I consider the power of taxing in Parliament as an instrument of empire, and not as a means of supply.

Such, sir, is my idea of the constitution of the British empire, as distinguished from the constitution of Britain; and on these grounds I think subordination and liberty may be sufficiently reconciled through the whole; whether to serve a refining speculatist or a factious demagogue, I know not; but enough, surely, for the ease and happiness of man.

Sir, while we held this happy course we drew more from the colonies than all the impotent violence of despotism ever could extort from them. We did this abundantly in the last war. It has never been once denied; and what reason have we to imagine that the colonies would not have proceeded in supplying Government as liberally, if you had not stepped in and hindered them from contributing by interrupting the channel in which their liberality flowed with so strong a course, by attempting to take, instead of being satisfied to receive? Sir William Temple says that Holland has loaded itself with ten times the impositions which it revolted from Spain rather than submit to. He says true. Tyranny is a poor provider. It knows neither how to accumulate nor how to extract.

I charge, therefore, to this new and unfortunate system, the loss not only of peace, of union, and of commerce, but even of revenue, which its friends are contending for. It is morally certain that we have lost at least a million of free grants since the peace. I think we have lost a great deal more; and that those who look for a revenue from the provinces never could have pursued, even in that light, a course more directly repugnant to their purposes.

Now, sir, I trust I have shown, first, on that narrow ground which the honourable gentleman measured, that you are like to lose nothing by complying with the motion except what you have lost already. I have shown afterward that in time of peace you flourished in commerce, and, when war required it, had sufficient aid from the colonies, while you pursued your ancient policy; that you threw everything into confusion when you made the Stamp Act; and that you restored everything to peace and order when you repealed it. I have shown that the revival of the system of taxation has produced the very worst effects; and that the partial repeal has produced, not partial good, but universal evil. Let these considerations, founded on facts, not one of which can be denied, bring us back to our reason by the road of our experience.

I cannot, as I have said, answer for mixed measures; but surely this mixture of lenity would give the whole a better chance of success. When you once regain confidence the way will be clear before you. Then you may enforce the Act of Navigation when it ought to be enforced. You will yourselves open it where it ought still further to be opened. Proceed in what you do, whatever you do, from policy, and not from rancour. Let us act like men, let us act like statesmen. Let us hold some sort of consistent conduct. It is agreed that a revenue is not to be had in America. If we lose the profit, let us get rid of the odium.

On this business of America, I confess I am serious even to sadness. I have had but one opinion concerning it since I sat, and before I sat, in Parliament. The noble lord [Lord North] will, as usual, probably attribute the part taken by me and my friends in this business to a desire of getting his places. Let him enjoy this happy and original idea. If I deprived him of it, I should take away most of his wit, and all his argument. But I had rather bear the brunt of all his wit, and, indeed, blows much heavier, than stand answerable to God for embracing a system that tends to the destruction of some of the very best and fairest of His works. But I know the map of England as well as the noble lord, or as any other person; and I know that the way I take is not the road to preferment. My excellent and honourable friend under me on the floor [Mr Dowdeswell] has trod that road with great toil for upwards of twenty years together. He is not yet arrived at the noble lord's destination. However, the tracks of my worthy friend are those I have ever wished to follow, because I know they lead to honour. Long may we tread the same road together, whoever may accompany us, or whoever may laugh at us on our journey. I honestly and solemnly declare I have in all seasons adhered to the system of 1766, for no other reason than that I think it laid deep in your truest interests;

and that, by limiting the exercise, it fixes on the firmest foundations a real, consistent, well-grounded authority in Parliament. Until you come back to that system, there will be no peace for England.

[Mr Burke's motion was negatived by a vote of 182 to 49; and the Act for quartering troops in Boston was passed about a month after.]

ON CONCILIATION WITH AMERICA.*

[On February 20th Lord North brought forward a resolution, which was agreed to, which was to the effect that, although Parliament could never relinquish the right of taxation, yet if the Americans would propose means of contributing their share to the common defence, the exercise of the right might, without hesitation, be suspended, and the privilege of raising their own portion of contribution conceded to the colonists. His design was to open the way for treating separately with the different provinces, and in creating hostile interests reduce the whole to subjection. The measure which Burke proposes in the following speech was: "To admit the Americans to an equal interest in the British constitution, and place them at once on the footing of other Englishmen." It has been remarked that there are more passages in this than in any other of Mr Burke's speeches, which have been admired and quoted for the richness of their imagery, and the force and beauty of their descriptions, whilst Sir James Mackintosh has pronounced it "the most faultless of Mr Burke's productions."]

I hope, sir, that, notwithstanding the austerity of the chair, your good-nature will incline you to some degree of indulgence towards human frailty. You will not think it unnatural that those who have an object depending, which strongly engages their hopes and fears, should be somewhat inclined to superstition. As I came into the House full of anxiety about the event of my motion, I found, to my infinite surprise, that the grand penal bill, by which we had passed sentence on the trade and sustenance of America, is to be returned to us from the other House.† I do confess I could not help looking on this event as a fortunate omen. I look upon it as a sort of providential favour, by which we are put once more in possession of our deliberative capacity, upon a business so very questionable in its nature, so very uncertain in its issue. By the return of this bill, which seemed to have taken its flight for ever, we are, at this very instant, nearly as free to choose a plan for our American government, as we were on the first day of the session. If, sir, we incline to the side of conciliation, we are not at all embarrassed (unless we please to make ourselves so) by any incongruous mixture of coercion and restraint. We are therefore called upon, as it were by a superior warning voice, again to attend to America; to attend to the whole of it together; and to review the subject with an unusual degree of care and calmness.

Surely it is an awful subject, or there is none so on this side of the grave. When I first had the honour of a seat in this House, the affairs of that continent pressed themselves upon us as the most important and most delicate object of Parliamentary attention. My little share in this great deliberation oppressed me. I found myself a partaker in a very high trust; and having no sort of reason to rely on the strength of my natural abilities for the proper execution of that trust, I was obliged to take more than common pains to instruct myself in everything which relates to our colonies. I was not less under the necessity of forming some fixed ideas concerning the general policy of the British empire. Something of this sort seemed to be indispensable, in order, amid so vast a fluctuation of passions and opinions, to concentre my thoughts; to ballast my conduct; to preserve me from being blown about by every wind of fashionable doctrine. I really did not think it safe, or manly, to have fresh principles to seek upon every fresh mail which should arrive from America.

At that period I had the fortune to find myself in perfect concurrence with a large majority in this House.* Bowing under that high authority, and penetrated with the sharpness and strength of that early impression, I have continued ever since in my original sentiments without the least deviation. Whether this be owing to an obstinate perseverance in error, or to a religious adherence to what appears to me truth and reason, it is in your equity to judge.

Sir, Parliament having an enlarged view of objects, made during this interval more frequent changes in their sentiment and their conduct than could be justified in a particular person upon the contracted scale of private information. But though I do not hazard anything approaching to a censure on the motives of former Parliaments to all those alterations, one fact is undoubted—that under them the state of America has been kept in continual agitation. Everything administered as remedy to the public complaint, if it did not produce, was at least followed by a heightening of the distemper; until, by a variety of experiments, that important country has been brought into her present situation—a situation which I will not miscall, which I dare not name,

* A speech delivered in the House of Commons, March 22, 1775.

† An Act interdicting the trade and fisheries of all the New England colonies.

* This was in 1766, when the Stamp Act was repealed by the Rockingham administration

which I scarcely know how to comprehend in the terms of any description.

In this posture, sir, things stood at the beginning of the session. About that time, a worthy member [Mr Rose Fuller] of great Parliamentary experience, who in the year 1766 filled the chair of the American committee with much ability, took me aside, and, lamenting the present aspect of our politics, told me things were come to such a pass, that our former methods of proceeding in the House would be no longer tolerated. That the public tribunal (never too indulgent to a long and unsuccessful Opposition) would now scrutinise our conduct with unusual severity. That the very vicissitudes and shiftings of ministerial measures, instead of convicting their authors of inconstancy and want of system, would be taken as an occasion of charging us with a predetermined discontent, which nothing could satisfy; while we accused every measure of vigour as cruel, and every proposal of lenity as weak and irresolute. The public, he said, would not have patience to see us play the game out with our adversaries: we must produce our hand. It would be expected that those who for many years had been active in such affairs, should show that they had formed some clear and decided idea of the principles of colony government, and were capable of drawing out something like a platform of the ground which might be laid for future and permanent tranquillity.

I felt the truth of what my honourable friend represented, but I felt my situation too. His application might have been made with far greater propriety to many other gentlemen. No man was, indeed, ever better disposed or worse qualified for such an undertaking than myself. Though I gave so far in to his opinion that I immediately threw my thoughts into a sort of Parliamentary form, I was by no means equally ready to produce them. It generally argues some degree of natural impotence of mind, or some want of knowledge of the world, to hazard plans of government, except from a seat of authority. Propositions are made, not only ineffectually, but somewhat disreputably, when the minds of men are not properly disposed for their reception; and, for my part, I am not ambitious of ridicule—not absolutely a candidate for disgrace.

Besides, sir, to speak the plain truth, I have in general no very exalted opinion of the virtue of paper government, nor of any politics in which the plan is to be wholly separated from the execution. But when I saw that anger and violence prevailed every day more and more, and that things were hastening toward an incurable alienation of our colonies, I confess my caution gave way. I felt this, as one of those few moments in which decorum yields to a higher duty. Public calamity is a mighty leveller, and there are occasions when any, even the slightest, chance of doing good, must be laid hold on, even by the most inconsiderable person.

To restore order and repose to an empire so great and so distracted as ours is merely in the attempt, an undertaking that would ennoble the flights of the highest genius, and obtain pardon for the efforts of the meanest understanding. Struggling a good while with these thoughts, by degrees I felt myself more firm. I derived, at length, some confidence from what in other circumstances usually produces timidity. I grew less anxious, even from the idea of my own insignificance. For, judging of what you are by what you ought to be, I persuaded myself that you would not reject a reasonable proposition because it had nothing but its reason to recommend it. On the other hand, being totally destitute of all shadow of influence, natural or adventitious, I was very sure that if my proposition were futile or dangerous—if it were weakly conceived or improperly timed, there was nothing exterior to it of power to awe, dazzle, or delude you. You will see it just as it is, and you will treat it just as it deserves.

The PROPOSITION is peace. Not peace through the medium of war; nor peace to be hunted through the labyrinth of intricate and endless negotiations; not peace to arise out of universal discord, fomented from principle in all parts of the empire; not peace to depend on the juridical determination of perplexing questions, or the precise marking the shadowy boundaries of a complex government. It is simple peace, sought in its natural course and its ordinary haunts. It is peace sought in the spirit of peace, and laid in principles purely pacific. I propose, by removing the ground of the difference, and by restoring the former unsuspecting confidence of the colonies in the mother country, to give permanent satisfaction to your people; and, far from a scheme of ruling by discord, to reconcile them to each other in the same Act, and by the bond of the very same interest, which reconciles them to British government.

My idea is nothing more. Refined policy ever has been the parent of confusion, and ever will be so as long as the world endures. Plain good intention, which is as easily discovered at the first view as fraud is surely detected at last, is (let me say) of no mean force in the government of mankind. Genuine simplicity of heart is a healing and cementing principle. My plan, therefore, being formed upon the most simple grounds imaginable, may disappoint some people when they hear it. It has nothing to recommend it to the pruriency of curious ears. There is nothing at all new and captivating in it. It has nothing of the splendour of the project which has been lately laid upon your table by the noble lord in the blue ribbon * [Lord North].

* "That when the governor, council, or assembly, or general court of any of his Majesty's provinces or

It does not propose to fill your lobby with squabbling colony agents, who will require the interposition of your mace at every instant to keep the peace among them. It does not institute a magnificent auction of finance, where captivated provinces come to general ransom by bidding against each other, until you knock down the hammer, and determine a proportion of payments beyond all the powers of algebra to equalise and settle.

The plan which I shall presume to suggest derives, however, one great advantage from the proposition and registry of that noble lord's project. The idea of conciliation is admissible. First, the House, in accepting the resolution moved by the noble lord, has admitted, notwithstanding the menacing front of our address, notwithstanding our heavy bill of pains and penalties, that we do not think ourselves precluded from all ideas of free grace and bounty.

The House has gone further; it has declared conciliation admissible, *previous* to any submission on the part of America. It has even shot a good deal beyond that mark, and has admitted that the complaints of our former mode of exerting the right of taxation were not wholly unfounded. That right, thus exerted, is allowed to have had something reprehensible in it, something unwise, or something grievous; since, in the midst of our heat and resentment, we, of ourselves, have proposed a capital alteration, and, in order to get rid of what seemed so very exceptionable, have instituted a mode that is altogether new; one that is, indeed, wholly alien from all the ancient methods and forms of Parliament.

The *principle* of this proceeding is large enough for my purpose. The means proposed by the noble lord for carrying his ideas into execution, I think, indeed, are very indifferently suited to the end; and this I shall endeavour to show you before I sit down. But, for the present, I take my ground on the admitted principle. I mean to give peace. Peace implies reconciliation; and, where there has been a material dispute, reconciliation does in a manner always imply concession on the one part or on the other. In this state of things I make no difficulty in affirming that the proposal ought to originate from us. Great and acknowledged force is not impaired, either in effect or in opinion, by an unwillingness to exert itself. The superior power may offer peace with honour and with safety. Such an offer from such a power will be attributed to magnanimity. But the concessions of the weak are the concessions of fear. When such a one is disarmed, he is wholly at the mercy of his superior, and he loses for ever that time and those chances which, as they happen to all men, are the strength and resources of all inferior power.

The capital leading questions on which you must this day decide, are these two: *First, whether you ought to concede; and, secondly, what your concession ought to be.*

I. On the first of these questions we have gained, as I have just taken the liberty of observing to you, some ground. But I am sensible that a good deal more is still to be done. Indeed, sir, to enable us to determine both on the one and the other of these great questions with a firm and precise judgment, I think it may be necessary to consider distinctly—

The true *nature* and the peculiar *circumstances* of the object which we have before us; because, after all our struggle, whether we will or not, we must govern America according to that nature and to those circumstances, and not according to our imaginations; not according to abstract ideas of right; by no means according to mere general theories of government, the resort to which appears to me, in our present situation, no better than arrant trifling. I shall therefore endeavour, with your leave, to lay before you some of the most material of these circumstances in as full and as clear a manner as I am able to state them.

(1.) The first thing that we have to consider with regard to the nature of the object, is the number of people in the colonies. I have taken for some years a good deal of pains on that point. I can by no calculation justify myself in placing the number below two millions of inhabitants of our own European blood and colour, besides at least five hundred thousand others, who form no inconsiderable part of the strength and opulence of the whole. This, sir, is, I believe, about the true number. There is no occasion to exaggerate, where plain truth is of so much weight and importance. But whether I put the present numbers too high or too low, is a matter of little moment. Such is the strength with which population shoots in that part of the world, that, state the numbers as high as we will, while the dispute continues, the exaggeration ends. While we are discussing any given magnitude, they are grown to it. While we spend our time in deliberating on the

colonies in America, shall propose to make provision, according to the condition, circumstances, and situation of such province or colony, for contributing their proportion to the common defence (such proportion to be raised under the authority of the general court or general assembly of such province or colony, and disposable by Parliament), and shall engage to make provision also for the support of the civil government and the administration of justice in such province or colony, it will be proper if such proposal shall be approved by his Majesty and the two Houses of Parliament, and for so long as such provision shall be made accordingly, to forbear, in respect of such province or colony, to levy any duty, tax, or assessment, or to impose any further duty, tax, or assessment, except such duties as it may be expedient to continue to levy or impose for the regulation of commerce; the net produce of the duties last mentioned to be carried to the account of such province or colony respectively."—Resolution moved by Lord North in the committee, and agreed to by the House, 27th February 1775.

mode of governing two millions, we shall find we have two millions more to manage. Your children do not grow faster from infancy to manhood, than they spread from families to communities, and from villages to nations.

I put this consideration of the present and the growing numbers in the front of our deliberation; because, sir, this consideration will make it evident to a blunter discernment than yours, that no partial, narrow, contracted, pinched, occasional system will be at all suitable to such an object. It will show you that it is not to be considered as one of those *minima* which are out of the eye and consideration of the law; not a paltry excrescence of the state, not a mean dependant, who may be neglected with little damage and provoked with little danger. It will prove that some degree of care and caution is required in the handling such an object; it will show that you ought not, in reason, to trifle with so large a mass of the interests and feelings of the human race. You could at no time do so without guilt; and, be assured, you will not be able to do it long with impunity.

(2.) But the population of this country, the great and growing population, though a very important consideration, will lose much of its weight if not combined with other circumstances. The commerce of your colonies is out of all proportion beyond the numbers of the people. This ground of their commerce, indeed, has been trod some days ago, and with great ability, by a distinguished person [Mr Gower] at your bar. This gentleman, after thirty-five years—it is so long since he appeared at the same place to plead for the commerce of Great Britain—has come again before you to plead the same cause, without any other effect of time than that, to the fire of imagination and extent of erudition which even then marked him as one of the first literary characters of his age, he has added a consummate knowledge in the commercial interest of his country, formed by a long course of enlightened and discriminating experience.

Sir, I should be inexcusable in coming after such a person with any detail, if a great part of the members who now fill the House had not the misfortune to be absent when he appeared at your bar. Besides, sir, I propose to take the matter at periods of time somewhat different from this. There is, if I mistake not, a point of view from whence, if you will look at this subject, it is impossible that it should not make an impression upon you.

I have in my hand two accounts: one a comparative state of the export trade of England to its colonies as it stood in the year 1704, and as it stood in the year 1772; the other a state of the export trade of this country to its colonies alone, as it stood in 1772, compared with the whole trade of England to all parts of the world, the colonies included, in the year 1704. They are from good vouchers; the latter period from the accounts on your table, the earlier from an original manuscript of Davenant, who first established the inspector-general's office, which has been ever since his time so abundant a source of Parliamentary information.

The export trade to the colonies consists of three great branches: the African, which, terminating almost wholly in the colonies, must be put to the account of their commerce; the West Indian, and the North American. All these are so interwoven that the attempt to separate them would tear to pieces the contexture of the whole, and, if not entirely destroy, would very much depreciate the value of all the parts. I therefore consider these three denominations to be, what in effect they are, one trade.

The trade to the colonies, taken on the export side, at the beginning of this century, that is, in the year 1704, stood thus:

Exports to North America and the West Indies, . . .	£483,265
To Africa, ...	86,665
	£569,930

In the year 1772, which I take as a middle year between the highest and lowest of those lately laid on your table, the account was as follows:

To North America and the West Indies, ...	£4,791,734
To Africa, ...	866,398
To which, if you add the export trade from Scotland, which had in 1704 no existence, .	364,000
	£6,022,132

From five hundred and odd thousand, it has grown to six millions. It has increased no less than twelvefold. This is the state of the colony trade, as compared with itself at these two periods, within this century; and this is matter for meditation. But this is not all. Examine my second account. See how the export trade to the colonies alone in 1772 stood in the other point of view, that is, as compared to the whole trade of England in 1704.

The whole export trade of England, including that to the colonies, in 1704, . . .	£6,509,000
Exported to the colonies alone, in 1772, ...	6,024,000
Difference,	£485,000

The trade with America alone is now within less than £500,000 of being equal to what this great commercial nation, England, carried on at the beginning of this century with the whole world! If I had taken the largest year of those on your table, it would rather have exceeded. But, it will be said, is not this American trade

an unnatural protuberance, that has drawn the juices from the rest of the body? The reverse. It is the very food that has nourished every other part into its present magnitude. Our general trade has been greatly augmented, and augmented more or less in almost every part to which it ever extended, but with this material difference, that of the six millions which in the beginning of the century constituted the whole mass of our export commerce, the colony trade was but one twelfth part; it is now (as a part of sixteen millions) considerably more than a third of the whole. This is the relative proportion of the importance of the colonies at these two periods; and all reasoning concerning our mode of treating them must have this proportion as its basis, or it is a reasoning weak, rotten, and sophistical.

Mr Speaker, I cannot prevail on myself to hurry over this great consideration. It is good for us to be here. We stand where we have an immense view of what is, and what is past. Clouds, indeed, and darkness rest upon the future. Let us, however, before we descend from this noble eminence, reflect that this growth of our national prosperity has happened within the short period of the life of man. It has happened within sixty-eight years. There are those alive whose memory might touch the two extremities. For instance, my Lord Bathurst might remember all the stages of the progress. He was in 1704 of an age at least to be made to comprehend such things. He was then old enough "acta parentum jam legere, et quæ sit poterit cognoscere virtus." Suppose, sir, that the angel of this auspicious youth, foreseeing the many virtues which made him one of the most amiable, as he is one of the most fortunate men of his age, had opened to him in vision, that when, in the fourth generation, the third prince of the House of Brunswick had sat twelve years on the throne of that nation, which, by the happy issue of moderate and healing councils, was to be made Great Britain, he should see his son, Lord Chancellor of England, turn back the current of hereditary dignity to its fountain, and raise him to a higher rank of peerage, while he enriched the family with a new one. If, amid these bright and happy scenes of domestic honour and prosperity, that angel should have drawn up the curtain, and unfolded the rising glories of his country, and while he was gazing with admiration on the then commercial grandeur of England, the genius should point out to him a little speck, scarce visible in the mass of the national interest, a small seminal principle rather than a formed body, and should tell him, "Young man, there is America—which at this day serves for little more than to amuse you with stories of savage men and uncouth manners; yet shall, before you taste death, show itself equal to the whole of that commerce which now attracts the envy of the world. Whatever England has been growing to by a progressive increase of improvement, brought in by varieties of people, by succession of civilising conquests and civilising settlements in a series of seventeen hundred years, you shall see as much added to her by America in the course of a single life!" If this state of his country had been foretold to him, would it not require all the sanguine credulity of youth, and all the fervid glow of enthusiasm, to make him believe it? Fortunate man, he has lived to see it! Fortunate, indeed, if he live to see nothing to vary the prospect and cloud the setting of his day!

Excuse me, sir, if, turning from such thoughts, I resume this comparative view once more. You have seen it on a large scale; look at it on a small one. I will point out to your attention a particular instance of it in the single province of Pennsylvania. In the year 1704 that province called for £11,459 in value of your commodities, native and foreign. This was the whole. What did it demand in 1772? Why, nearly fifty times as much; for in that year the export to Pennsylvania was £507,909, nearly equal to the export to all the colonies together in the first period.

I choose, sir, to enter into these minute and particular details, because generalities, which, in all other cases are apt to heighten and raise the subject, have here a tendency to sink it. When we speak of the commerce with our colonies, fiction lags after truth, invention is unfruitful, and imagination cold and barren.

So far, sir, as to the importance of the object in the view of its commerce, as concerned in the exports from England. If I were to detail the imports, I could show how many enjoyments they procure, which deceive the burden of life; how many materials which invigorate the springs of national industry, and extend and animate every part of our foreign and domestic commerce. This would be a curious subject indeed; but I must prescribe bounds to myself in a matter so vast and various.

(3.) I pass, therefore, to the colonies in another point of view—their agriculture. This they have prosecuted with such a spirit, that, besides feeding plentifully their own growing multitude, their annual export of grain, comprehending rice, has, some years ago, exceeded a million in value. Of their last harvest I am persuaded they will export much more. At the beginning of the century, some of these colonies imported corn from the mother country. For some time past the old world has been fed from the new. The scarcity which you have felt would have been a desolating famine, if this child of your old age, with a true filial piety, with a Roman charity, had not put the full breast of its youthful exuberance to the mouth of its exhausted parent.*

* This deed of "Roman charity" is told in Pliny's

(4.) As to the wealth which the colonies have drawn from the sea by their fisheries, you had all that matter fully opened at your bar. You surely thought those acquisitions of value, for they seemed even to excite your envy; and yet the spirit by which that enterprising employment has been exercised, ought rather, in my opinion, to have raised your esteem and admiration. And pray, sir, what in the world is equal to it? Pass by the other parts, and look at the manner in which the people of New England have of late carried on the whale fishery. While we follow them among the tumbling mountains of ice, and behold them penetrating into the deepest frozen recesses of Hudson's Bay and Davis's Straits—while we are looking for them beneath the Arctic circle, we hear that they have pierced into the opposite region of Polar cold—that they are at the antipodes, and engaged under the frozen Serpent of the south.* Falkland Island, which seemed too remote and romantic an object for the grasp of national ambition, is but a stage and resting-place in the progress of their victorious industry. Nor is the equinoctial heat more discouraging to them than the accumulated winter of both the poles. We know that while some of them draw the line and strike the harpoon on the coast of Africa, others run the longitude, and pursue their gigantic game along the coast of Brazil. No sea but what is vexed by their fisheries. No climate that is not witness to their toils. Neither the perseverance of Holland, nor the activity of France, nor the dexterous and firm sagacity of English enterprise, ever carried this most perilous mode of hardy industry to the extent to which it has been pushed by this recent people—a people who are still, as it were, but in the gristle, and not yet hardened into the bone of manhood. When I contemplate these things—when I know that the colonies in general owe little or nothing to any care of ours, and that they are not squeezed into this happy form by the constraints of watchful and suspicious government, but that, through a wise and salutary neglect, a generous nature has been suffered to take her own way to perfection—when I reflect upon these effects—when I see how profitable they have been to us, I feel all the pride of power sink, and all presumption in the wisdom of human contrivances melt and die away within me. My rigour relents. I pardon something to the spirit of liberty.

I am sensible, sir, that all which I have asserted in my detail is admitted in the gross; but that quite a different conclusion is drawn from it. America, gentlemen say, is a noble object. It is an object well worth fighting for. Certainly it is, if fighting a people be the best way of gaining them. Gentlemen in this respect will be led to their choice of means by their complexions and their habits. Those who understand the military art will, of course, have some predilection for it. Those who wield the thunder of the state may have more confidence in the efficacy of arms. But I confess, possibly for want of this knowledge, my opinion is much more in favour of prudent management than of force; considering force not as an odious, but a feeble instrument, for preserving a people so numerous, so active, so growing, so spirited as this, in a profitable and subordinate connection with us.

1. First, sir, permit me to observe, that the use of force alone is but *temporary*. It may subdue for a moment, but it does not remove the necessity of subduing again; and a nation is not governed which is perpetually to be conquered.

2. My next objection is its *uncertainty*. Terror is not always the effect of force; and an armament is not a victory. If you do not succeed, you are without resource; for, conciliation failing, force remains; but, force failing, no further hope of reconciliation is left. Power and authority are sometimes bought by kindness, but they can never be begged as alms by an impoverished and defeated violence.

3. A further objection to force is, that you *impair the object* by your very endeavours to preserve it. The thing you fought for is not the thing which you recover; but depreciated, sunk, wasted, and consumed in the contest. Nothing less will content me than *whole* America. I do not choose to consume its strength along with our own, because in all parts it is the British strength that I consume. I do not choose to be caught by a foreign enemy at the end of this exhausting conflict, and still less in the midst of it. I may escape; but I can make no insurance against such an event. Let me add, that I do not choose wholly to break the American spirit, because it is the spirit that has made the country.

4. Lastly, we have no sort of *experience* in favour of force as an instrument in the rule of our colonies. Their growth and their utility has been owing to methods altogether different. Our ancient indulgence has been said to be pursued to a fault. It may be so; but we know, if feeling is evidence, that our fault was more tolerable than our attempt to mend it; and our sin far more salutary than our penitence.

These, sir, are my reasons for not entertaining that high opinion of untried force, by which many gentlemen, for whose sentiments in other

---

"Natural History," and is to the effect that a woman condemned to be strangled in prison was left instead by the jailer to perish for want of food. She was visited frequently by her daughter, and still continued to exist, when the jailer determined to discover the secret. Coming suddenly upon them, he found that the daughter (who had some time previously given birth to a child) was supporting her from her own breast.

* The Hydrus, or Water Serpent, a small constellation lying to the south, within the Antarctic circle.

particulars I have great respect, seem to be so greatly captivated.

But there is still behind a third consideration concerning this object, which serves to determine my opinion on the sort of policy which ought to be pursued in the management of America, even more that its population and its commerce—I mean its temper and character. In this character of the Americans *a love of freedom* is the predominating feature, which marks and distinguishes the whole; and, as an ardent is always a jealous affection, your colonies become suspicious, restive, and untractable, whenever they see the least attempt to wrest from them by force, or shuffle from them by chicane, what they think the only advantage worth living for. This fierce spirit of liberty is stronger in the English colonies, probably, than in any other people of the earth, and this from a variety of powerful causes, which, to understand the true temper of their minds, and the direction which this spirit takes, it will not be amiss to lay open somewhat more largely.

1. First, the people of the colonies are descendants of Englishmen. England, sir, is a nation which still, I hope, respects, and formerly adored her freedom. The colonists emigrated from you when this part of your character was most predominant; and they took this bias and direction the moment they parted from your hands. They are, therefore, not only devoted to liberty, but to liberty according to English ideas and on English principles. Abstract liberty, like other mere abstractions, is not to be found. Liberty inheres in some sensible object; and every nation has formed to itself some favourite point which, by way of eminence, becomes the criterion of their happiness. It happened, you know, sir, that the great contests for freedom in this country were, from the earliest times, chiefly upon the question of taxing. Most of the contests in the ancient commonwealths turned primarily on the right of election of magistrates, or on the balance among the several orders of the state. The question of money was not with them so immediate. But in England it was otherwise. On this point of taxes the ablest pens and most eloquent tongues have been exercised; the greatest spirits have acted and suffered. In order to give the fullest satisfaction concerning the importance of this point, it was not only necessary for those who in argument defended the excellence of the English constitution, to insist on this privilege of granting money as a dry point of fact, and to prove that the right had been acknowledged in ancient parchments and blind usages to reside in a certain body called the House of Commons. They went much further: they attempted to prove (and they succeeded) that in theory it ought to be so, from the particular nature of a House of Commons, as an immediate representative of the people, whether the old records had delivered this oracle or not. They took infinite pains to inculcate, as a fundamental principle, that, in all monarchies, the people must, in effect, themselves, mediately or immediately, possess the power of granting their own money, or no shadow of liberty could subsist. The colonies draw from you, as with their life-blood, those ideas and principles. Their love of liberty, as with you, fixed and attached on this specific point of taxing. Liberty might be safe or might be endangered in twenty other particulars, without their being much pleased or alarmed. Here they felt its pulse; and, as they found that beat, they thought themselves sick or sound. I do not say whether they were right or wrong in applying your general arguments to their own case. It is not easy, indeed, to make a monopoly of theorems and corollaries. The fact is, that they did thus apply those general arguments; and your mode of governing them, whether through lenity or indolence, through wisdom or mistake, confirmed them in the imagination that they, as well as you, had an interest in these common principles.

2. They were further confirmed in this pleasing error by the form of their provincial legislative assemblies. Their governments are popular in a high degree; some are merely popular; in all, the popular representative is the most weighty; and this share of the people in their ordinary government never fails to inspire them with lofty sentiments, and with a strong aversion from whatever tends to deprive them of their chief importance.

3. If anything were wanting to this necessary operation of the form of government, religion would have given it a complete effect. Religion, always a principle of energy, in this new people is no way worn out or impaired; and their mode of professing it is also one main cause of this free spirit. The people are Protestants; and of that kind which is the most adverse to all implicit submission of mind and opinion. This is a persuasion not only favourable to liberty, but built upon it. I do not think, sir, that the reason of this averseness in the dissenting churches from all that looks like absolute government, is so much to be sought in their religious tenets as in their history. Every one knows that the Roman Catholic religion is at least coeval with most of the Governments where it prevails; that it has generally gone hand in hand with them; and received great favour and every kind of support from authority. The Church of England, too, was formed from her cradle under the nursing care of regular government. But the dissenting interests have sprung up in direct opposition to all the ordinary powers of the world, and could justify that opposition only on a strong claim to natural liberty. Their very existence depended on the powerful and unremitted assertion of that claim. All Protestantism, even the most cold and passive, is a

kind of dissent. But the religion most prevalent in our northern colonies is a refinement on the principle of resistance; it is the dissidence of dissent, and the Protestantism of the Protestant religion. This religion, under a variety of denominations, agreeing in nothing but in the communion of the spirit of liberty, is predominant in most of the northern provinces; where the Church of England, notwithstanding its legal rights, is in reality no more than a sort of private sect, not composing most probably the tenth of the people. The colonists left England when this spirit was high, and in the emigrants was the highest of all; and even that stream of foreigners, which has been constantly flowing into these colonies, has, for the greatest part, been composed of dissenters from the establishments of their several countries, and have brought with them a temper and character far from alien to that of the people with whom they mixed.

4. Sir, I can perceive by their manner that some gentlemen object to the latitude of this description, because in the southern colonies the Church of England forms a large body, and has a regular establishment. It is certainly true. There is, however, a circumstance attending these colonies, which, in my opinion, fully counterbalances this difference, and makes the spirit of liberty still more high and haughty than in those to the northward. It is that in Virginia and the Carolinas they have a vast multitude of *slaves*. Where this is the case in any part of the world, those who are free are by far the most proud and jealous of their freedom. Freedom is to them not only an enjoyment, but a kind of rank and privilege. Not seeing there that freedom, as in countries where it is a common blessing, and as broad and general as the air, may be united with much abject toil, with great misery, with all the exterior of servitude, liberty looks, among them, like something that is more noble and liberal. I do not mean, sir, to commend the superior morality of this sentiment, which has at least as much pride as virtue in it; but I cannot alter the nature of man. The fact is so; and these people of the southern colonies are much more strongly, and with a higher and more stubborn spirit, attached to liberty than those to the northward. Such were all the ancient commonwealths; such were our Gothic ancestors; such, in our days, were the Poles; and such will be all masters of slaves, who are not slaves themselves. In such a people the haughtiness of domination combines with the spirit of freedom, fortifies it, and renders it invincible.

5. Permit me, sir, to add another circumstance in our colonies, which contributes no mean part toward the growth and effect of this untractable spirit—I mean their *education*. In no country perhaps in the world is the law so general a study. The profession itself is numerous and powerful; and in most provinces it takes the lead. The greater number of the deputies sent to Congress were lawyers. But all who read, and most do read, endeavour to obtain some smattering in that science. I have been told by an eminent bookseller, that in no branch of his business, after tracts of popular devotion, were so many books as those on the law exported to the Plantations. The colonists have now fallen into the way of printing them for their own use. I hear that they have sold nearly as many of Blackstone's Commentaries in America as in England. General Gage marks out this disposition very particularly in a letter on your table. He states that all the people in his government are lawyers, or smatterers in law; and that in Boston they have been enabled, by successful chicane, wholly to evade many parts of one of your capital penal constitutions. The smartness of debate will say that this knowledge ought to teach them more clearly the rights of legislature, their obligations to obedience, and the penalties of rebellion. All this is mighty well. But my honourable and learned friend [Mr, afterward Lord Thurlow] on the floor, who condescends to mark what I say for animadversion, will disdain that ground. He has heard, as well as I, that when great honours and great emoluments do not win over this knowledge to the service of the state, it is a formidable adversary to Government. If the spirit be not tamed and broken by these happy methods, it is stubborn and litigious. *Abeunt studia in mores* (studies pass into habits). This study renders men acute, inquisitive, dexterous, prompt in attack, ready in defence, full of resources. In other countries, the people, more simple and of a less mercurial cast, judge of an ill principle in government only by an actual grievance. Here they anticipate the evil, and judge of the pressure of the grievance by the badness of the principle. They augur misgovernment at a distance; and snuff the approach of tyranny in every tainted breeze.

6. The last cause of this disobedient spirit in the colonies is hardly less powerful than the rest, as it is not merely moral, but laid deep in the natural constitution of things. Three thousand miles of ocean lie between you and them. No contrivance can prevent the effect of this distance in weakening government. Seas roll, and months pass, between the order and the execution; and the want of a speedy explanation of a single point is enough to defeat the whole system. You have, indeed, "winged ministers" of vengeance, who carry your bolts in their pounces to the remotest verge of the sea. But there a power steps in, that limits the arrogance of raging passions and furious elements, and says, "So far shalt thou go, and no further." Who are you, that should fret and rage, and bite the chains of nature? Nothing

worse happens to you than does to all nations who have extensive empire; and it happens in all the forms into which empire can be thrown. In large bodies, the circulation of power must be less vigorous at the extremities. Nature has said it. The Turk cannot govern Egypt, and Arabia, and Koordistan, as he governs Thrace: nor has he the same dominion in Crimea and Algiers which he has at Broosa and Smyrna. Despotism itself is obliged to truck and huckster. The sultan gets such obedience as he can. He governs with a loose rein, that he may govern at all; and the whole of the force and vigour of his authority in his centre, is derived from a prudent relaxation in all his borders. Spain, in her provinces, is, perhaps, not so well obeyed as you are in yours. She complies too; she submits; she watches times. This is the immutable condition, the eternal law, of extensive and detached empire.

Then, sir, from these six capital sources of descent, of form of government, of religion in the northern provinces, of manners in the southern, of education, of the remoteness of situation from the first mover of government—from all these causes a fierce spirit of liberty has grown up. It has grown with the growth of the people in your colonies, and increased with the increase of their wealth; a spirit that, unhappily meeting with an exercise of power in England, which, however lawful, is not reconcilable to any ideas of liberty, much less with theirs, has kindled this flame that is ready to consume us.

I do not mean to commend either the spirit in this excess, or the moral causes which produce it. Perhaps a more smooth and accommodating spirit of freedom in them would be more acceptable to us. Perhaps ideas of liberty might be desired, more reconcilable with an arbitrary and boundless authority. Perhaps we might wish the colonists to be persuaded that their liberty is more secure when held in trust for them by us, as guardians during a perpetual minority, than with any part of it in their own hands. But the question is not whether their spirit deserves praise or blame. What, in the name of God, shall we do with it? You have before you the object, such as it is, with all its glories, with all its imperfections on its head. You see the magnitude, the importance, the temper, the habits, the disorders. By all these considerations we are strongly urged to determine something concerning it. We are called upon to fix some rule and line for our future conduct, which may give a little stability to our politics, and prevent the return of such unhappy deliberations as the present. Every such return will bring the matter before us in a still more untractable form. For, what astonishing and incredible things have we not seen already? What monsters have not been generated from this unnatural contention? While every principle of authority and resistance has been pushed upon both sides as far as it would go, there is nothing so solid and certain, either in reasoning or in practice, that has not been shaken. Until very lately, all authority in America seemed to be nothing but an emanation from yours. Even the popular part of the colony constitution derived all its activity and its first vital movement from the pleasure of the Crown. We thought, sir, that the utmost which the discontented colonists could do was to disturb authority. We never dreamed they could of themselves supply it, knowing in general what an operose business it is to establish a government absolutely new. But having, for our purposes in this contention, resolved that none but an obedient assembly should sit, the humours of the people there, finding all passage through the legal channel stopped, with great violence broke out another way. Some provinces have tried their experiment, as we have tried ours; and theirs has succeeded. They have formed a government sufficient for its purposes, without the bustle of a revolution or the troublesome formality of an election. Evident necessity and tacit consent have done the business in an instant. So well they have done it, that Lord Dunmore (the account is among the fragments on your table) tells you that the new institution is infinitely better obeyed than the ancient government ever was in its most fortunate periods. Obedience is what makes government, and not the names by which it is called; not the name of governor, as formerly, or committee, as at present. This new government has originated directly from the people, and was not transmitted through any of the ordinary artificial media of a positive constitution. It was not a manufacture ready formed, and transmitted to them in that condition from England. The evil arising from hence is this: that the colonists having once found the possibility of enjoying the advantages of order in the midst of a struggle for liberty, such struggles will not henceforward seem so terrible to the settled and sober part of mankind as they had appeared before the trial.

Pursuing the same plan of punishing by the denial of the exercise of government to still greater lengths, we wholly abrogated the ancient government of Massachusetts. We were confident that the first feeling, if not the very prospect of anarchy, would instantly enforce a complete submission. The experiment was tried. A new, strange, unexpected face of things appeared. Anarchy is found tolerable. A vast province has now subsisted, and subsisted in a considerable degree of health and vigour, for near a twelvemonth, without governor, without public council, without judges, without executive magistrates. How long it will continue in this state, or what may arise out of this unheard-of situation, how can the wisest of us conjecture? Our late experience has taught us that

many of those fundamental principles, formerly believed infallible, are either not of the importance they were imagined to be, or that we have not at all adverted to some other far more important and far more powerful principles, which entirely overrule those we had considered as omnipotent. I am much against any further experiments which tend to put to the proof any more of these allowed opinions, which contribute so much to the public tranquillity. In effect, we suffer as much at home by this loosening of all ties, and this concussion of all established opinions, as we do abroad. For, in order to prove that the Americans have no right to their liberties, we are every day endeavouring to subvert the maxims which preserve the whole spirit of our own. To prove that the Americans ought not to be free, we are obliged to depreciate the value of freedom itself; and we never seem to gain a paltry advantage over them in debate, without attacking some of those principles, or deriding some of those feelings for which our ancestors have shed their blood.

But, sir, in wishing to put an end to pernicious experiments, I do not mean to preclude the fullest inquiry. Far from it. Far from deciding on a sudden or partial view, I would patiently go round and round the subject, and survey it minutely in every possible aspect. Sir, if I were capable of engaging you to an equal attention, I would state that, as far as I am capable of discerning, there are but three ways of proceeding relative to this stubborn spirit which prevails in your colonies and disturbs your government. These are, to change that spirit, as inconvenient, by removing the causes, to prosecute it as criminal, or to comply with it as necessary. I would not be guilty of an imperfect enumeration. I can think of but these three. Another has, indeed, been started —that of giving up the colonies; but it met so slight a reception that I do not think myself obliged to dwell a great while upon it. It is nothing but a little sally of anger, like the frowardness of peevish children, who, when they cannot get all they would have, are resolved to take nothing.

1. The *first* of these plans, to change the spirit, as inconvenient, by removing the causes, I think is the most like a systematic proceeding. It is radical in its principle, but it is attended with great difficulties, some of them little short, as I conceive, of impossibilities. This will appear by examining into the plans which have been proposed.

As the growing population of the colonies is evidently one cause of their resistance, it was last session mentioned in both Houses by men of weight, and received, not without applause, that, in order to check this evil, it would be proper for the Crown to make no further grants of land. But to this scheme there are two objections. The first, that there is already so much unsettled land in private hands as to afford room for an immense future population, although the Crown not only withheld its grants, but annihilated its soil. If this be the case, then the only effect of this avarice of desolation, this hoarding of a royal wilderness, would be to raise the value of the possessions in the hands of the great private monopolists without any adequate check to the growing and alarming mischief of population.

But if you stopped your grants, what would be the consequence? The people would occupy without grants. They have already so occupied in many places. You cannot station garrisons in every part of these deserts. If you drive the people from one place, they will carry on their annual tillage, and remove with their flocks and herds to another. Many of the people in the back settlements are already little attached to particular situations. Already they have topped the Apalachian Mountains. From thence they behold before them an immense plain, one vast, rich, level meadow—a square of five hundred miles. Over this they would wander without a possibility of restraint. They would change their manners with the habits of their life; would soon forget a government by which they were disowned; would become hordes of English Tartars; and, pouring down upon your unfortified frontiers a fierce and irresistible cavalry, become masters of your governors and your councillors, your collectors and controllers, and of all the slaves that adhered to them. Such would, and, in no long time, must be the effect of attempting to forbid as a crime, and to suppress as an evil, the command and blessing of Providence, "Increase and multiply." Such would be the happy result of an endeavour to keep as a lair of wild beasts that earth which God by an express charter has given to the children of men. Far different, and surely much wiser, has been our policy hitherto. Hitherto we have invited our people, by every kind of bounty, to fixed establishments. We have invited the husbandman to look to authority for his title. We have taught him piously to believe in the mysterious virtue of wax and parchment. We have thrown each tract of land, as it was peopled, into districts, that the ruling power should never be wholly out of sight. We have settled all we could, and we have carefully attended every settlement with government.

Adhering, sir, as I do, to this policy, as well as for the reasons I have just given, I think this new project of hedging in population to be neither prudent nor practicable.

To impoverish the colonies in general, and in particular to arrest the noble course of their marine enterprises, would be a more easy task. I freely confess it. We have shown a disposition to a system of this kind; a disposition even to continue the restraint after the offence, looking on ourselves as rivals to our colonies, and

persuaded that of course we must gain all that they shall lose. Much mischief we may certainly do. The power inadequate to all other things is often more than sufficient for this. I do not look on the direct and immediate power of the colonies to resist our violence as very formidable. In this, however, I may be mistaken. But when I consider that we have colonies for no purpose but to be serviceable to us, it seems to my poor understanding a little preposterous to make them unserviceable in order to keep them obedient. It is, in truth, nothing more than the old, and, as I thought, exploded problem of tyranny, which proposes to beggar its subjects into submission. But, remember, when you have completed your system of impoverishment, that nature still proceeds in her ordinary course; that discontent will increase with misery; and that there are critical moments in the fortune of all states, when they who are too weak to contribute to your prosperity may be strong enough to complete your ruin. "Spoliatis arma supersunt" ("Arms remain to the plundered").

The temper and character which prevail in our colonies are, I am afraid, unalterable by any human art. We cannot, I fear, falsify the pedigree of this fierce people, and persuade them that they are not sprung from a nation in whose veins the blood of freedom circulates. The language in which they would hear you tell them this tale would detect the imposition. Your speech would betray you. An Englishman is the unfittest person on earth to argue another Englishman into slavery.

I think it is nearly as little in our power to change their republican religion as their free descent; or to substitute the Roman Catholic as a penalty, or the Church of England as an improvement. The mode of inquisition and dragooning is going out of fashion in the old world, and I should not confide much to their efficacy in the new. The education of the Americans is also on the same unalterable bottom with their religion. You cannot persuade them to burn their books of curious science; to banish their lawyers from their courts of law; or to quench the lights of their assemblies, by refusing to choose those persons who are best read in their privileges. It would be no less impracticable to think of wholly annihilating the popular assemblies in which these lawyers sit. The army, by which we must govern in their place, would be far more chargeable to us; not quite so effectual; and perhaps, in the end, full as difficult to be kept in obedience.

With regard to the high aristocratic spirit of Virginia and the southern colonies, it has been proposed, I know, to reduce it, by declaring a general enfranchisement of their slaves. This project has had its advocates and panegyrists, yet I never could argue myself into an opinion of it. Slaves are often much attached to their masters. A general wild offer of liberty would not always be accepted. History furnishes few instances of it. It is sometimes as hard to persuade slaves to be free as it is to compel freemen to be slaves; and in this auspicious scheme we should have both these pleasing tasks on our hands at once. But when we talk of enfranchisement, do we not perceive that the American master may enfranchise too, and arm servile hands in defence of freedom? A measure to which other people have had recourse more than once, and not without success, in a desperate situation of their affairs.

Slaves as these unfortunate black people are, and dull as all men are from slavery, must they not a little suspect the offer of freedom from that very nation which has sold them to their present masters? From that nation, one of whose causes of quarrel with those masters is their refusal to deal any more in that inhuman traffic? An offer of freedom from England would come rather oddly, shipped to them in an African vessel, which is refused an entry into the ports of Virginia or Carolina, with a cargo of three hundred Angola negroes. It would be curious to see the Guinea captain attempt at the same instant to publish his proclamation of liberty and to advertise his sale of slaves.

But let us suppose all these moral difficulties got over. The ocean remains. You cannot pump this dry; and as long as it continues in its present bed, so long all the causes which weaken authority by distance will continue.

> "Ye gods! annihilate but space and time,
> And make two lovers happy!"

was a pious and passionate prayer, but just as reasonable as many of these serious wishes of very grave and solemn politicians.

2. If then, sir, it seems almost desperate to think of any alterative course for changing the moral causes (and not quite easy to remove the natural) which produce the prejudices irreconcilable to the late exercise of our authority, but that the spirit infallibly will continue, and, continuing, will produce such effects as now embarrass us, the *second* mode under consideration is to prosecute that spirit in its overt acts as *criminal*.

At this proposition I must pause a moment. The thing seems a great deal too big for my ideas of jurisprudence. It should seem, to my way of conceiving such matters, that there is a very wide difference in reason and policy between the mode of proceeding on the irregular conduct of scattered individuals, or even of bands of men, who disturb order within the state, and the civil dissensions which may, from time to time, on great questions, agitate the several communities which compose a great empire. It looks to me to be narrow and pedantic to apply the ordinary ideas of criminal justice to this great public contest. I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a

whole people. I cannot insult and ridicule the feelings of millions of my fellow-creatures, as Sir Edward Coke insulted one excellent individual [Sir Walter Raleigh] at the bar.* I am not ripe to pass sentence on the gravest public bodies, entrusted with magistracies of great authority and dignity, and charged with the safety of their fellow-citizens, upon the very same title that I am. I really think that for wise men this is not judicious; for sober men, not decent; for minds tinctured with humanity, not mild and merciful.

Perhaps, sir, I am mistaken in my idea of an empire, as distinguished from a single state or kingdom. But my idea of it is this: that an empire is the aggregate of many states, under one common head, whether this head be a monarch or a presiding republic. It does, in such constitutions, frequently happen (and nothing but the dismal, cold, dead uniformity of servitude can prevent its happening) that the subordinate parts have many local privileges and immunities. Between these privileges and the supreme common authority, the line may be extremely nice. Of course, disputes—often, too, very bitter disputes—and much ill blood, will arise. But though every privilege is an exemption, in the case, from the ordinary exercise of the supreme authority, it is no denial of it. The claim of a privilege seems rather, *ex vi termini* (from the very import of the term), to imply a superior power; for to talk of the privileges of a state or of a person who has no superior, is hardly any better than speaking nonsense. Now, in such unfortunate quarrels among the component parts of a great political union of communities, I can scarcely conceive anything more completely imprudent than for the head of the empire to insist that, if any privilege is pleaded against his will or his acts, that his *whole* authority is denied; instantly to proclaim rebellion, to beat to arms, and to put the offending provinces under the ban. Will not this, sir, very soon teach the provinces to make no distinctions on their part? Will it not teach them that the government against which a claim of liberty is tantamount to high treason, is a government to which submission is equivalent to slavery? It may not always be quite convenient to impress dependent communities with such an idea.

We are, indeed, with all disputes with the colonies, by the necessity of things, the judge. It is true, sir; but I confess that the character of judge in my own cause is a thing that frightens me. Instead of filling me with pride, I am exceedingly humbled by it. I cannot proceed with a stern, assured, judicial confidence, until I find myself in something more like a judicial character. I must have these hesitations as long as I am compelled to recollect that, in my little reading upon such contests as these, the sense of mankind has at least as often decided against the superior as the subordinate power. Sir, let me add, too, that the opinion of my having some abstract right in my favour, would not put me much at my ease in passing sentence, unless I could be sure that there were no rights which, in their exercise under certain circumstances, were not the most odious of all wrongs, and the most vexatious of all injustice. Sir, these considerations have great weight with me, when I find things so circumstanced that I see the same party at once a civil litigant against me in point of right and a culprit before me; while I sit as criminal judge on acts of his whose moral quality is to be decided on upon the merits of that very litigation. Men are every now and then put, by the complexity of human affairs, into strange situations; but justice is the same, let the judge be in what situation he will.

There is, sir, also a circumstance which convinces me that this mode of criminal proceeding is not, at least in the present stage of our contest, altogether expedient, which is nothing less than the conduct of those very persons who have seemed to adopt that mode, by lately declaring a rebellion in Massachusetts Bay, as they had formerly addressed to have traitors brought hither, under an Act of Henry VIII., for trial. For, though rebellion is declared, it is not proceeded against as such; nor have any steps been taken toward the apprehension or conviction of any individual offender, either on our late or our former address; but modes of *public* coercion have been adopted, and such as have much more resemblance to a sort of qualified hostility toward an independent power than the punishment of rebellious subjects. All this seems rather inconsistent; but it shows how difficult it is to apply these juridical ideas to our present case.

In this situation, let us seriously and coolly ponder. What is it we have got by all our menaces, which have been many and ferocious? What advantage have we derived from the penal laws we have passed, and which for the time have been severe and numerous? What advances have we made toward our object by the sending of a force which, by land and sea, is no contemptible strength? Has the disorder abated? Nothing less. When I see things in this situation, after such confident hopes, bold promises, and active exertions, I cannot, for my life, avoid a suspicion that the plan itself is not correctly right.

* See Howell's "State Trials," vol. ii., p. 7, *et seq.*: "*Coke.* I will prove you the notoriousest traitor that ever came to the bar. *Raleigh.* Your words cannot condemn me; my innocency is my defence. *Coke.* Thou art a monster. Thou hast an English face, but a Spanish heart. *Raleigh.* Let me answer for myself. *Coke.* Thou shalt not. *Raleigh.* It concerneth my life. *Coke.* Oh! Do I touch you? Now see the most horrible practices that ever came out of the bottomless pit of the lowest hell. *Raleigh.* Here is no treason of mine. If Lord Cobham be a traitor, what is that to me? *Coke.* All that he did was by thy instigation, thou viper."

If, then, the removal of the causes of this spirit of American liberty be, for the greater part, or rather entirely, impracticable; if the ideas of criminal process be inapplicable, or, if applicable, are in the highest degree inexpedient, what way yet remains? No way is open but the third and last—to comply with the American spirit as necessary, or, if you please, to submit to it as a necessary evil.

If we adopt this mode, if we mean to conciliate and concede, let us see—

II. OF WHAT NATURE THE CONCESSION OUGHT TO BE. To ascertain the nature of our concession, we must look at their complaint. The colonies complain that they have not the characteristic mark and seal of British freedom. They complain that they are taxed in Parliament in which they are not represented. If you mean to satisfy them at all, you must satisfy them with regard to this complaint. If you mean to please any people, you must give them the boon which they ask; not what you may think better for them, but of a kind totally different. Such an Act may be a wise regulation, but it is no concession, whereas our present theme is the mode of giving satisfaction.

Sir, I think you must perceive that I am resolved this day to have nothing at all to do with the question of the right of taxation. Some gentlemen startle, but it is true. I put it totally out of the question. It is less than nothing in my consideration. I do not, indeed, wonder, nor will you, sir, that gentlemen of profound learning are fond of displaying it on this profound subject. But my consideration is narrow, confined, and wholly limited to the policy of the question. I do not examine whether the giving away a man's money be a power excepted and reserved out of a general trust of government, and how far all mankind, in all forms of polity, are entitled to an exercise of that right by the charter of nature; or whether, on the contrary, a right of taxation is necessarily involved in the general principle of legislation, and inseparable from the ordinary supreme power. These are deep questions, where great names militate against each other; where reason is perplexed; and an appeal to authorities only thickens the confusion; for high and reverend authorities lift up their heads on both sides, and there is no sure footing in the middle. This point is

> "That Serbonian bog
> Betwixt Damieta and Mount Cassius old,
> Where armies whole have sunk."
>
> —*Milton's Par. Lost*, ii. 594.

I do not intend to be overwhelmed in this bog, though in such respectable company. The question with me is not whether you have a right to render your people miserable, but whether it is not your interest to make them happy. It is not what a lawyer tells me I *may* do, but what humanity, reason, and justice tell me I *ought* to do. Is a politic act the worse for being a generous one? Is no concession proper but that which is made from your want of right to keep what you grant? Or does it lessen the grace or dignity of relaxing in the exercise of an odious claim, because you have your evidence-room full of titles, and your magazines stuffed with arms to enforce them? What signify all those titles and all those arms? Of what avail are they, when the reason of the thing tells me that the assertion of my title is the loss of my suit, and that I could do nothing but wound myself by the use of my own weapons?

Such is steadfastly my opinion of the absolute necessity of keeping up the concord of this empire by a unity of spirit, though in a diversity of operations, that, if I were sure the colonists had, at their leaving this country, sealed a regular compact of servitude; that they had solemnly abjured all the rights of citizens; that they had made a vow to renounce all ideas of liberty for them and their posterity to all generations, yet I should hold myself obliged to conform to the temper I found universally prevalent in my own day, and to govern two millions of men, impatient of servitude, on the principles of freedom. I am not determining a point of law. I am restoring tranquillity, and the general character and situation of a people must determine what sort of government is fitted for them. That point nothing else can or ought to determine.

My idea, therefore, without considering whether we yield as matter of right, or grant as matter of favour, is *to admit the people of our colonies into an interest in the constitution*, and, by recording that admission in the journals of Parliament, to give them as strong an assurance as the nature of the thing will admit, that we mean for ever to adhere to that solemn declaration of systematic indulgence.

Some years ago, the repeal of a revenue Act, upon its understood principle, might have served to show that we intended an unconditional abatement of the exercise of a taxing power. Such a measure was then sufficient to remove all suspicion, and to give perfect content. But unfortunate events, since that time, may make something further necessary, and not more necessary for the satisfaction of the colonies, than for the dignity and consistency of our own future proceedings.

I have taken a very incorrect measure of the disposition of the House, if this proposal in itself would be received with dislike. I think, sir, we have few American financiers. But our misfortune is, we are too acute; we are too exquisite in our conjectures of the future, for men oppressed with such great and present evils. The more moderate among the opposers of Parliamentary concession freely confess that they hope no good from taxation, but they apprehend the colonists have further views, and, if this point were conceded, they would instantly

attack the trade laws. These gentlemen are convinced that this was the intention from the beginning, and the quarrel of the Americans with taxation was no more than a cloak and cover to this design. Such has been the language even of a gentleman [Mr Rice] of real moderation, and of a natural temper well adjusted to fair and equal government. I am, however, sir, not a little surprised at this kind of discourse, whenever I hear it; and I am the more surprised, on account of the arguments which I constantly find in company with it, and which are often urged from the same mouths and on the same day.

For instance, when we allege that it is against reason to tax a people under so many restraints in trade as the Americans, the noble lord [Lord North] in the blue ribbon shall tell you that the restraints on trade are futile and useless; of no advantage to us, and of no burden to those on whom they are imposed; that the trade of America is not secured by the Acts of Navigation, but by the natural and irresistible advantage of a commercial preference.

Such is the merit of the trade laws in this posture of the debate. But when strong internal circumstances are urged against the taxes; when the scheme is dissected; when experience and the nature of things are brought to prove, and do prove, the utter impossibility of obtaining an effective revenue from the colonies; when these things are pressed, or rather press themselves, so as to drive the advocates of colony taxes to a clear admission of the futility of the scheme; then, sir, the sleeping trade laws revive from their trance, and this useless taxation is to be kept sacred, not for its own sake, but as a counter-guard and security of the laws of trade.

Then, sir, you keep up revenue laws which are mischievous, in order to preserve trade laws that are useless. Such is the wisdom of our plan in both its members. They are separately given up as of no value, and yet one is always to be defended for the sake of the other. But I cannot agree with the noble lord, nor with the pamphlet from whence he seems to have borrowed these ideas, concerning the inutility of the trade laws; for, without idolising them, I am sure they are still, in many ways, of great use to us; and in former times, they have been of the greatest. They do confine, and they do greatly narrow the market for the Americans; but my perfect conviction of this does not help me in the least to discern how the revenue laws form any security whatsoever to the commercial regulations, or that these commercial regulations are the true ground of the quarrel, or that the giving way in any one instance of authority is to lose all that may remain unconceded.

One fact is clear and indisputable. The public and avowed origin of this quarrel was on taxation. This quarrel has indeed brought on new disputes on new questions, but certainly the least bitter, and the fewest of all, on the trade laws. To judge which of the two be the real radical cause of quarrel, we have to see whether the commercial dispute did, in order of time, precede the dispute on taxation. There is not a shadow of evidence for it. Next, to enable us to judge whether at this moment a dislike to the trade laws be the real cause of quarrel, it is absolutely necessary to put the taxes out of the question by a repeal. See how the Americans act in this position, and then you will be able to discern correctly what is the true object of the controversy, or whether any controversy at all will remain. Unless you consent to remove this cause of difference, it is impossible, with decency, to assert that the dispute is not upon what it is avowed to be. And I would, sir, recommend to your serious consideration, whether it be prudent to form a rule for punishing people, not on their own acts, but on your conjectures. Surely it is preposterous at the very best. It is not justifying your anger by their misconduct, but it is converting your ill will into their delinquency.

But the colonies will go further. Alas! alas! when will this speculating against fact and reason end? What will quiet these panic fears which we entertain of the hostile effect of a conciliatory conduct? Is it true that no case can exist in which it is proper for the sovereign to accede to the desires of his discontented subjects? Is there anything peculiar in this case to make a rule for itself? Is all authority of course lost, when it is not pushed to the extreme? Is it a certain maxim, that the fewer causes of dissatisfaction are left by government, the more the subject will be inclined to resist and rebel?

All these objections being, in fact, no more than suspicions, conjectures, divinations, formed in defiance of fact and experience, they did not, sir, discourage me from entertaining the idea of a conciliatory concession, founded on the principles which I have just stated.

In forming a plan for this purpose, I endeavoured to put myself in that frame of mind which was the most natural and the most reasonable, and which was certainly the most probable means of securing me from all error. I set out with a perfect distrust of my own abilities; a total renunciation of every speculation of my own; and with a profound reverence for the wisdom of our ancestors, who have left us the inheritance of so happy a constitution and so flourishing an empire, and, what is a thousand times more valuable, the treasury of the maxims and principles which formed the one and obtained the other.

During the reigns of the Kings of Spain of the Austrian family, whenever they were at a loss in the Spanish councils, it was common for their statesmen to say, that they ought to consult the genius of Philip II. The genius of Philip II. might mislead them; and the issue of their affairs showed that they had not

chosen the most perfect standard. But, sir, I am sure that I shall not be misled, when, in a case of constitutional difficulty, I consult the genius of the English constitution. Consulting at that oracle (it was with all due humility and piety), I found four capital examples in a similar case before me: those of Ireland, Wales, Chester, and Durham.

(1.) Ireland, before the English conquest, though never governed by a despotic power, had no Parliament. How far the English Parliament itself was at that time modelled according to the present form, is disputed among antiquarians.* But we have all the reason in the world to be assured, that a form of Parliament, such as England then enjoyed, she instantly communicated to Ireland; and we are equally sure that almost every successive improvement in constitutional liberty, as fast as it was made here, was transmitted thither. The feudal baronage and the feudal knighthood, the roots of our primitive constitution, were early transplanted into that soil, and grew and flourished there. Magna Charta, if it did not give us originally the House of Commons, gave us, at least, a House of Commons of weight and consequence. But your ancestors did not churlishly sit down alone to the feast of Magna Charta. Ireland was made immediately a partaker. This benefit of English laws and liberties, I confess, was not at first extended to *all* Ireland. Mark the consequence. English authority and English liberty had exactly the same boundaries. Your standard could never be advanced an inch before your privileges. Sir John Davis shows beyond a doubt that the refusal of a general communication of these rights was the true cause why Ireland was five hundred years in subduing; and after the vain projects of a military government, attempted in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, it was soon discovered that nothing could make that country English, in civility and allegiance, but your laws and your forms of legislature. It was not English arms, but the English constitution, that conquered Ireland. From that time, Ireland has ever had a general Parliament, as she had before a partial Parliament. You changed the people; you altered the religion; but you never touched the form or the vital substance of free government in that kingdom. You deposed kings; you restored them; you altered the succession to theirs, as well as to your own crown; but you never altered their constitution, the principle of which was respected by usurpation, restored with the restoration of monarchy, and established, I trust, for ever, by the glorious revolution. This has made Ireland the great and flourishing kingdom that it is; and from a disgrace and a burden intolerable to this nation, has rendered her a principal part of our strength and ornament. This country cannot be said to have ever formally taxed her. The irregular things done in the confusion of mighty troubles, and on the hinge of great revolutions, even if all were done that is said to have been done, form no example. If they have any effect in argument, they make an exception to prove the rule. None of your own liberties could stand a moment if the casual deviations from them, at such times, were suffered to be used as proofs of their nullity. By the lucrative amount of such casual breaches in the constitution, judge what the stated and fixed rule of supply has been in that kingdom. Your Irish pensioners would starve, if they had no other fund to live on than taxes granted by English authority. Turn your eyes to those popular grants from whence all your great supplies are come, and learn to respect that only source of public wealth in the British empire.

(2.) My next example is Wales. This country was said to be reduced by Henry III. It was said more truly to be so by Edward I. But though then conquered, it was not looked upon as any part of the realm of England. Its old constitution, whatever that might have been, was destroyed, and no good one was substituted in its place. The care of that tract was put into the hands of lords marchers—a form of government of a very singular kind; a strange heterogeneous monster, something between hostility and government; perhaps it has a sort of resemblance, according to the modes of those times, to that of commander-in-chief at present, to whom all civil power is granted as secondary. The manners of the Welsh nation followed the genius of the government. The people were ferocious, restive, savage, and uncultivated; sometimes composed, never pacified. Wales, within itself, was in perpetual disorder; and it kept the frontier of England in perpetual alarm. Benefits from it to the state there were none. Wales was only known to England by incursion and invasion.

Sir, during that state of things, Parliament was not idle. They attempted to subdue the fierce spirit of the Welsh by all sorts of rigorous laws. They prohibited by statute the sending all sorts of arms into Wales, as you prohibit by proclamation (with something more of doubt on the legality) the sending arms to America. They

* "The single throne of the one primate at Canterbury accustomed men's minds to the thought of a single throne for their one temporal over-lord at York, or, as in later days, at Lichfield or at Winchester. The regular subordination of priest to bishop, of bishop to primate, in the administration of the Church, supplied a mould on which the civil organisation of the state quickly shaped itself. Above all, the councils gathered by Theodore were the first of all national gatherings for general legislation. It was at a much later time that the Wise Men of Wessex, or Northumbria, or Mercia, learned to come together in the Witenagemote of all England. It was the ecclesiastical synods which, by their example, led the way to our national Parliaments, as it was the canons enacted in such synods which led the way to a national system of law."—*J. R. Green.*

disarmed the Welsh by statute, as you attempted (but still with more question on the legality) to disarm New England by an instruction. They made an Act to drag offenders from Wales into England for trial, as you have done (but with more hardship) with regard to America. By another Act, where one of the parties was an Englishman, they ordained that his trial should be always by English. They made Acts to restrain trade, as you do; and they prevented the Welsh from the use of fairs and markets, as you do the Americans from fisheries and foreign ports. In short, when the statute-book was not quite so much swelled as it is now, you find no less than fifteen Acts of penal regulation on the subject of Wales.

Here we rub our hands. A fine body of precedents for the authority of Parliament and the use of it! I admit it fully; and pray add likewise to these precedents, that all the while Wales rid this kingdom like an *incubus;* that it was an unprofitable and oppressive burden; and that an Englishman travelling in that country could not go six yards from the highroad without being murdered.

The march of the human mind is slow. Sir, it was not until after two hundred years discovered that, by an eternal law, Providence had decreed vexation to violence, and poverty to rapine. Your ancestors did, however, at length open their eyes to the ill husbandry of injustice. They found that the tyranny of a free people could of all tyrannies the least be endured, and that laws made against a whole nation were not the most effectual methods for securing its obedience. Accordingly, in the twenty-seventh year of Henry VIII., the course was entirely altered. With a preamble stating the entire and perfect rights of the Crown of England, it gave to the Welsh all the rights and privileges of English subjects. A political order was established; the military power gave way to the civil; the marches were turned into counties. But that a nation should have a right to English liberties, and yet no share at all in the fundamental security of these liberties, the grant of their own property, seemed a thing so incongruous, that eight years after, that is, in the thirty-fifth of that reign, a complete and not ill-proportioned representation by counties and boroughs was bestowed upon Wales by Act of Parliament. From that moment, as by a charm, the tumults subsided; obedience was restored; peace, order, and civilisation, followed in the train of liberty. When the day-star of the English constitution had arisen in their hearts, all was harmony within and without.

"Simul alba nautis
Stella refulsit,
Defluit saxis agitatus humor:
Concidunt venti, fugiuntque nubes;
Et minax (quod sic voluere) ponto
Unda recumbit."

("When *their* auspicious star
To the sailor shines afar,
The troubled waters leave the rocks at rest:
The clouds are gone, the winds are still,
The angry wave obeys their will,
And calmly sleeps upon the ocean's breast.")
—*Horace to Augustus Cæsar*, lib. i. 12.

(3.) The very same year the county palatine of Chester received the same relief from its oppressions and the same remedy to its disorders. Before this time Chester was little less distempered than Wales. The inhabitants, without rights themselves, were the fittest to destroy the rights of others; and from thence Richard II. drew the standing army of archers with which for a time he oppressed England. The people of Chester applied to Parliament in a petition penned as I shall read to you:

"To the king our sovereign lord, in most humble wise shown unto your excellent Majesty, the inhabitants of your grace's county palatine of Chester; that where the said county palatine of Chester is and hath been always hitherto exempt, excluded and separated out and from your high court of Parliament, to have any knights and burgesses within the said court; by reason whereof the said inhabitants have hitherto sustained manifold disherisons, losses, and damages, as well in their lands, goods, and bodies, as in the good, civil, and politic governance and maintenance of the commonwealth of their said country. . . . And, forasmuch as the said inhabitants have always hitherto been bound by the Acts and statutes made and ordained by your said highness and your most noble progenitors, by authority of the said court, as far forth as other counties, cities, and boroughs have been, that have had their knights and burgesses within your said court of Parliament, and yet have had neither knight nor burgess there for the said county palatine; the said inhabitants, for lack thereof, have been oftentimes touched and grieved with Acts and statutes made within the said court, as well derogatory unto the most ancient jurisdictions, liberties, and privileges of your said county palatine, as prejudicial unto the common wealth, quietness, rest, and peace of your grace's most bounden subjects inhabiting within the same."

What did Parliament with this audacious address? Reject it as a libel? Treat it as an affront to Government? Spurn it as a derogation from the rights of legislature? Did they toss it over the table? Did they burn it by the hands of the common hangman? They took the petition of grievance, all rugged as it was, without softening or temperament, unpurged of the original bitterness and indignation of complaint; they made it the very preamble to their Act of redress, and consecrated its principle to all ages in the sanctuary of legislation.

Here is my third example. It was attended with the success of the two former. Chester,

civilised as well as Wales, has demonstrated that freedom, and not servitude, is the cure of anarchy, as religion, and not atheism, is the true remedy for superstition. Sir, this pattern of Chester was followed in the reign of Charles II. with regard to the county palatine of Durham, which is my fourth example. This county had long lain out of the pale of free legislation. So scrupulously was the example of Chester followed, that the style of the preamble is nearly the same with that of the Chester Act; and without affecting the abstract extent of the authority of Paliament, it recognises the equity of not suffering any considerable district in which the British subjects may act as a body to be taxed without their own voice in the grant.

Now, if the doctrines of policy contained in these preambles, and the force of these examples in the Acts of Parliament, avail anything, what can be said against applying them with regard to America? Are not the people of America as much Englishmen as the Welsh? The preamble of the Act of Henry VIII. says the Welsh speak a language no way resembling that of his Majesty's English subjects. Are the Americans not as numerous? If we may trust the learned and accurate Judge Barrington's account of North Wales, and take that as a standard to measure the rest, there is no comparison. The people can not amount to above two hundred thousand; not a tenth part of the number in the colonies. Is America in rebellion? Wales was hardly ever free from it. Have you attempted to govern America by penal statutes? You made fifteen for Wales. But your legislative authority is perfect with regard to America. Was it less perfect in Wales, Chester, and Durham? But America is virtually represented. What, does the electric force of virtual representation more easily pass over the Atlantic than pervade Wales, which lies in your neighbourhood; or than Chester and Durham, surrounded by abundance of representation that is actual and palpable? But, sir, your ancestors thought this sort of virtual representation, however ample, to be totally insufficient for the freedom of the inhabitants of territories that are so near, and comparatively so inconsiderable. How, then, can I think it sufficient for those which are infinitely greater and infinitely more remote?

You will now, sir, perhaps imagine that I am on the point of proposing to you a scheme for representation of the colonies in Parliament. Perhaps I might be inclined to entertain some such thought, but a great flood stops me in my course. *Opposuit natura* (nature forbids). I cannot remove the eternal barriers of the creation. The thing in that mode I do not know to be possible. As I meddle with no theory, I do not absolutely assert the impracticability of such a representation; but I do not see my way to it; and those who have been more confident have not been more successful. However, the arm of public benevolence is not shortened, and there are often several means to the same end. What nature has disjoined in one way wisdom may unite in another. When we cannot give the benefit as we would wish, let us not refuse it altogether. If we cannot give the principal, let us find a substitute. But how? Where? What substitute?

Fortunately I am not obliged for the ways and means of this substitute to tax my own unproductive invention. I am not even obliged to go to the rich treasury of the fertile framers of imaginary commonwealths; not to the Republic of Plato, not to the Utopia of More, not to the Oceana of Harrington. It is before me. It is at my feet—

> "And the dull swain
> Treads daily on it with his clouted shoon."
> —*Milton's Comus.*

I only wish you to recognise, for the theory, the ancient constitutional policy of this kingdom with regard to representation, as that policy has been declared in Acts of Parliament; and, as to the practice, to return to that mode which a uniform experience has marked out to you as best, and in which you walked with security, advantage, and honour, until the year 1763.

My resolutions, therefore, mean to establish the equity and justice of a taxation of America by *grant*, and not by *imposition*. To mark the *legal competency* of the colony assemblies for the support of their government in peace, and for public aids in time of war. To acknowledge that this legal competency has had *a dutiful and beneficial exercise;* and that experience has shown the *benefit of their grants*, and the *futility of Parliamentary taxation as a method of supply.*

These solid truths compose six fundamental propositions. There are three more resolutions corollary to these. If you admit the first set, you can hardly reject the others. But if you admit the first, I shall be far from solicitous whether you accept or refuse the last. I think these six massive pillars will be of strength sufficient to support the temple of British concord. I have no more doubt than I entertain of my existence, that, if you admitted these, you would command an immediate peace; and, with but tolerable future management, a lasting obedience in America. I am not arrogant in this confident assurance. The propositions are all mere matters of fact; and if they are such facts as draw irresistible conclusions even in the stating, this is the power of truth, and not any management of mine.

Sir, I shall open the whole plan to you together, with such observations on the motions as may tend to illustrate them where they may want explanation. The first is a resolution "That the colonies and plantations of Great Britain in North America, consisting of fourteen separate governments, and containing two millions and upwards of free inhabitants, have not

had the liberty and privilege of electing and sending any knights and burgesses or others to represent them in the high court of Parliament." This is a plain matter of fact, necessary to be laid down, and (excepting the description) it is laid down in the language of the constitution: it is taken nearly verbatim from Acts of Parliament.

The second is like unto the first—"That the said colonies and plantations have been liable to and bounden by several subsidies, payments, rates, and taxes, given and granted by Parliament, though the said colonies and plantations have not their knights and burgesses in the said high court of Parliament, of their own election, to represent the condition of their country; by lack whereof they have been oftentimes touched and grieved by subsidies given, granted, and assented to, in said court, in a manner prejudicial to the commonwealth, quietness, rest, and peace of the subjects inhabiting within the same."

Is this description too hot or too cold, too strong or too weak? Does it arrogate too much to the supreme legislature? Does it lean too much to the claims of the people? If it runs into any of these errors the fault is not mine. It is the language of your own ancient Acts of Parliament.

"Non meus hic sermo est sed quæ præcipit Ofellus
Rusticus, abnormis sapiens."

("The precept is not mine.
Ofellus gave it in his rustic strain,
Irregular, but wise.")—*Horace, Sat.*, i. 2.

It is the genuine produce of the ancient, rustic, manly, home-bred sense of this country. I did not dare to rub off a particle of the venerable rust that rather adorns and preserves, than destroys the metal. It would be a profanation to touch with a tool the stones which construct the sacred altar of peace.* I would not violate with modern polish the ingenuous and noble roughness of these truly constitutional materials. Above all things, I was resolved not to be guilty of tampering, the odious vice of restless and unstable minds. I put my foot in the tracks of our forefathers, where I can neither wander nor stumble. Determining to fix articles of peace, I was resolved not to be wise beyond what was written; I was resolved to use nothing else than the form of sound words, to let others abound in their own sense, and carefully to abstain from all expressions of my own. What the law has said, I say. In all things else I am silent. I have no organ but for her words. This, if it be not ingenious, I am sure, is safe.

There are, indeed, words expressive of grievance in this second resolution, which those who are resolved always to be in the right will deny to contain matter of fact, as applied to the present case, although Parliament thought them true with regard to the counties of Chester and Durham. They will deny that the Americans were ever "touched and grieved" with the taxes. If they consider nothing in taxes but their weight as pecuniary impositions, there might be some pretence for this denial. But men may be sorely touched and deeply grieved in their privileges as well as in their purses. Men may lose little in property by the Act which takes away all their freedom. When a man is robbed of a trifle on the highway, it is not the twopence lost that constitutes the capital outrage. This is not confined to privileges. Even ancient indulgences withdrawn, without offence on the part of those who enjoyed such favours, operate as grievances. But were the Americans, then, not touched and grieved by the taxes, in some measure, merely as taxes? If so, why were they almost all either wholly repealed or exceedingly reduced? Were they not touched and grieved, even by the regulating duties of the sixth of George II.? Else why were the duties first reduced to one-third in 1764, and afterward to a third of that third in the year 1766? Were they not touched and grieved by the Stamp Act? I shall say they were, until that tax is revived. Were they not touched and grieved by the duties of 1767, which were likewise repealed, and which Lord Hillsborough tells you, for the ministry, were laid contrary to the true principle of commerce? Is not the assurance given by that noble person to the colonies of a resolution to lay no more taxes on them an admission that taxes would touch and grieve them? Is not the resolution of the noble lord in the blue ribbon, now standing on your journals, the strongest of all proofs that Parliamentary subsidies really touched and grieved them? Else why all these changes, modifications, repeals, assurances, and resolutions?

The next proposition is: "That, from the distance of the said colonies, and from other circumstances, no method hath hitherto been devised for procuring a representation in Parliament for the said colonies." This is an assertion of a fact. I go no further on the paper; though, in my private judgment, a useful representation is impossible; I am sure it is not desired by them, nor ought it, perhaps, by us; but I abstain from opinions.

The fourth resolution is: "That each of the said colonies hath within itself a body, chosen in part, or in the whole, by the freemen, freeholders, or other free inhabitants thereof, commonly called the General Assembly, or General Court, with powers legally to raise, levy, and assess, according to the several usages of such colonies, duties and taxes toward the defraying all sorts of public services."

This competence in the colony assemblies is certain. It is proved by the whole tenor of their

* "If thou lift thy tool upon it [the altar], thou hast polluted it."—*Exodus* xx. 25.

Acts of supply in all the assemblies in which the constant style of granting is "an aid to his Majesty;" and Acts granting to the Crown have regularly, for near a century, passed the public offices without dispute. Those who have been pleased paradoxically to deny this right, holding that none but the British Parliament can grant to the Crown, are wished to look to what is done, not only in the colonies, but in Ireland, in one uniform unbroken tenor every session. Sir, I am surprised that this doctrine should come from some of the law servants of the Crown. I say that if the Crown could be responsible, his Majesty, but certainly the ministers, and even these law officers themselves, through whose hands the Acts pass biennially in Ireland, or annually in the colonies, are in a habitual course of committing impeachable offences. What habitual offenders have been all presidents of the council, all secretaries of state, all first lords of trade, all attorneys, and all solicitors-general! However, they are safe, as no one impeaches them; and there is no ground of charge against them except in their own unfounded theories.

The fifth resolution is also a resolution of fact: "That the said general assemblies, general courts, or other bodies legally qualified as aforesaid, have at sundry times freely granted several large subsidies and public aids for his Majesty's service, according to their abilities, when required thereto by letter from one of his Majesty's principal secretaries of state. And that their right to grant the same, and their cheerfulness and sufficiency in the said grants, have been at sundry times acknowledged by Parliament." To say nothing of their great expenses in the Indian wars; and not to take their exertion in foreign ones, so high as the supplies in the year 1695, not to go back to their public contributions in the year 1710, I shall begin to travel only where the journals give me light; resolving to deal in nothing but fact authenticated by Parliamentary record, and to build myself wholly on that solid basis.

On the 4th of April 1748 a committee of this House came to the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That it is the opinion of this committee, *that it is just and reasonable* that the several provinces and colonies of Massachusetts Bay, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, be reimbursed the expenses they have been at in taking and securing to the Crown of Great Britain the island of Cape Breton and its dependencies."

These expenses were immense for such colonies. They were above £200,000 sterling; money first raised and advanced on their public credit.

On the 28th of January 1756, a message from the king came to us, to this effect: "His Majesty, being sensible of the zeal and vigour with which his faithful subjects of certain colonies in North America have exerted themselves in defence of his Majesty's just rights and possessions, recommends it to this House to take the same into their consideration, and to enable his Majesty to give them such assistance as may be a *proper reward and encouragement*."

On the 3d of February 1756, the House came to a suitable resolution, expressed in words nearly the same as those of the message; but with the further addition, that the money then voted was an *encouragement* to the colonies to exert themselves with vigour. It will not be necessary to go through all the testimonies which your own records have given to the truth of my resolutions. I will only refer you to the places in the journals: Vol. xxvii.—16th and 19th May 1757. Vol. xxviii.—June 1st, 1758; April 26th and 30th, 1759; March 26th and 31st, and April 28th, 1760; January 9th and 20th, 1761. Vol. xxix.—January 22d and 26th, 1762; March 14th and 17th, 1763.

Sir, here is the repeated acknowledgment of Parliament, that the colonies not only gave, but gave to satiety. This nation has formally acknowledged two things; first, that the colonies had gone beyond their abilities, Parliament having thought it necessary to reimburse them; secondly, that they had acted legally and laudably in their grants of money, and their maintenance of troops, since the compensation is expressly given as reward and encouragement. Reward is not bestowed for acts that are unlawful; and encouragement is not held out to things that deserve reprehension. My resolution, therefore, does nothing more than collect into one proposition what is scattered through your journals. I give you nothing but your own, and you cannot refuse in the gross what you have so often acknowledged in detail. The admission of this, which will be so honourable to them and to you, will, indeed, be mortal to all the miserable stories by which the passions of the misguided people have been engaged in an unhappy system. The people heard, indeed, from the beginning of these disputes, one thing continually dinned in their ears, that reason and justice demanded that the Americans, who paid no taxes, should be compelled to contribute. How did that fact of their paying nothing stand, when the taxing system began? When Mr Grenville began to form his system of American revenue, he stated in this House that the colonies were then in debt two million six hundred thousand pounds sterling money, and was of opinion they would discharge that debt in four years. On this state, those untaxed people were actually subject to the payment of taxes to the amount of six hundred and fifty thousand a year. In fact, however, Mr Grenville was mistaken. The funds given for sinking the debt did not prove quite so ample as both the colonies and he expected. The calculation was too sanguine; the reduction was not completed till some years after, and at different times in different colonies. However,

the taxes after the war continued too great to bear any addition, with prudence or propriety; and when the burdens imposed in consequence of former requisitions were discharged, our tone became too high to resort again to requisition. No colony, since that time, ever has had any requisition whatsoever made to it.

We see the sense of the Crown, and the sense of Parliament, on the productive nature of a *revenue by grant.* Now search the same journals for the produce of the *revenue by imposition.* Where is it? Let us know the volume and the page. What is the gross, what is the net produce? To what service is it applied? How have you appropriated its surplus? What, can none of the many skilful index-makers that we are now employing find any trace of it? Well, let them and that rest together. But are the journals, which say nothing of the revenue, as silent on the discontent? Oh no! a child may find it. It is the melancholy burden and blot of every page.

I think, then, I am, from those journals, justified in the sixth and last resolution, which is: "That it hath been found by experience that the manner of granting the said supplies and aids, by the said general assemblies, hath been more agreeable to the said colonies, and more beneficial and conducive to the public service, than the mode of giving and granting aids in Parliament, to be raised and paid in the said colonies." This makes the whole of the fundamental part of the plan. The conclusion is irresistible. You cannot say that you were driven by any necessity to an exercise of the utmost rights of legislature. You cannot assert that you took on yourselves the task of imposing colony taxes, from the want of another legal body, that is competent to the purpose of supplying the exigencies of the state without wounding the prejudices of the people. Neither is it true that the body so qualified, and having that competence, had neglected the duty.

The question now, on all this accumulated matter is, whether you will choose to abide by a profitable experience, or a mischievous theory; whether you choose to build on imagination or fact; whether you prefer enjoyment or hope; satisfaction in your subjects or discontent?

If these propositions are accepted, everything which has been made to enforce a contrary system must, I take it for granted, fall along with it. On that ground I have drawn the following resolution, which, when it comes to be moved, will naturally be divided in a proper manner: "That it may be proper to repeal an Act, made in the seventh year of the reign of his present Majesty, entitled, An Act for granting certain duties in the British colonies and plantations in America; for allowing a drawback of the duties of customs upon the exportation from this kingdom of coffee and cocoa-nuts of the produce of the said colonies or plantations; for discontinuing the drawbacks payable on china earthenware exported to America, and for more effectually preventing the clandestine running of goods in the said colonies and plantations; and that it may be proper to repeal an Act, made in the fourteenth year of the reign of his present Majesty, entitled, An Act to discontinue, in such manner, and for such time as are therein mentioned, the landing and discharging, lading or shipping, of goods, wares, and merchandise, at the town and within the harbour of Boston, in the province of Massachusetts Bay, in North America; and that it may be proper to repeal an Act, made in the fourteenth year of the reign of his present Majesty, entitled, An Act for the impartial administration of justice in the cases of persons questioned for any acts done by them in the execution of the law, or for the suppression of riots and tumults in the province of Massachusetts Bay, in New England; and that it may be proper to repeal an Act, made in the fourteenth year of the reign of his present Majesty, entitled, An Act for the better regulating the government of the province of Massachusetts Bay, in New England; and also, that it may be proper to explain and amend an Act, made in the thirty-fifth year of the reign of King Henry VIII., entitled, An Act for the trial of treasons committed out of the king's dominions."

I wish, sir, to repeal the Boston Port Bill, because (independently of the dangerous precedent of suspending the rights of the subject during the king's pleasure) it was passed, as I apprehend, with less regularity, and on more partial principles, than it ought. The corporation of Boston was not heard before it was condemned. Other towns, full as guilty as she was, have not had their ports blocked up. Even the restraining bill of the present session does not go to the length of the Boston Port Act. The same ideas of prudence which induced you not to extend equal punishment to equal guilt, even when you were punishing, induce me, who mean not to chastise, but to reconcile, to be satisfied with the punishment already partially inflicted.

Ideas of prudence, and accommodation to circumstances, prevent you from taking away the charters of Connecticut and Rhode Island, as you have taken away that of Massachusetts Colony, though the Crown has far less power in the two former provinces than it enjoyed in the latter; and though the abuses have been full as great and as flagrant in the exempted as in the punished. The same reasons of prudence and accommodation have weight with me in restoring the charter of Massachusetts Bay. Besides, sir, the Act which changes the charter of Massachusetts is in many particulars so exceptionable, that if I did not wish absolutely to repeal, I would by all means desire to alter it, as several of its provisions tend to the subversion of all public and private justice. Such, among others,

is the power in the governor to change the sheriff at his pleasure, and to make a new returning officer for every special cause. It is shameful to behold such a regulation standing among English laws.

The act for bringing persons accused of committing murder under the orders of government to England for trial, is but temporary. That act has calculated the probable duration of our quarrel with the colonies, and is accommodated to that supposed duration. I would hasten the happy moment of reconciliation, and therefore must, on my principle, get rid of that most justly obnoxious act.

The act of Henry the Eighth, for the trial of treasons, I do not mean to take away, but to confine it to its proper bounds and original intention; to make it expressly for trial of treasons (and the greatest treasons may be committed) in places where the jurisdiction of the crown does not extend.

Having guarded the privileges of local legislature, I would next secure to the colonies a fair and unbiased judicature; for which purpose, sir, I propose the following resolution: "That, from the time when the General Assembly or General Court of any colony or plantation in North America, shall have appointed by act of assembly, duly confirmed, a settled salary to the offices of the Chief Justice and other judges of the Superior Court, it may be proper that the said Chief Justice and other judges of the Superior Courts of such colony, shall hold his and their office and offices during their good behaviour, and shall not be removed therefrom, but when the said removal shall be adjudged by his Majesty in council, upon a hearing on complaint from the General Assembly, or on a complaint from the Governor, or Council, or the House of Representatives severally, of the colony in which the said Chief Justice and other judges have exercised the said offices."

The next resolution relates to the courts of Admiralty.

It is this: "That it may be proper to regulate the Courts of Admiralty, or Vice Admiralty, authorised by the 15th chapter of the fourth of George III., in such a manner as to make the same more commodious to those who sue, or are sued, in the said courts, and to provide for the more decent maintenance of the judges in the same."

These courts I do not wish to take away. They are in themselves proper establishments. This court is one of the capital securities of the Act of Navigation. The extent of its jurisdiction, indeed, has been increased; but this is altogether as proper, and is, indeed, on many accounts, more eligible, where new powers were wanted, than a court absolutely new. But courts incommodiously situated, in effect, deny justice; and a court, partaking in the fruits of its own condemnation, is a robber. The Congress complain, and complain justly, of this grievance.*

There are the three consequential propositions. I have thought of two or three more, but they come rather too near detail, and to the province of executive government, which I wish Parliament always to superintend, never to assume. If the first six are granted, congruity will carry the latter three. If not, the things that remain unrepealed will be, I hope, rather unseemly encumbrances on the building, than very materially detrimental to its strength and stability.

Here, sir, I should close, but that I plainly perceive some objections remain, which I ought, if possible, to remove. The first will be that, in resorting to the doctrine of our ancestors, as contained in the preamble to the Chester Act, I prove too much; that the grievance from a want of representation stated in that preamble, goes to the whole of legislation as well as to taxation. And that the colonies, grounding themselves upon that doctrine, will apply it to all parts of legislative authority.

To this objection, with all possible deference and humility, and wishing as little as any man living to impair the smallest particle of our supreme authority, I answer that *the words are the words of Parliament, and not mine;* and that all false and inconclusive inferences drawn from them are not mine, for I heartily disclaim any such inference. I have chosen the words of an Act of Parliament, which Mr Grenville, surely a tolerably zealous and very judicious advocate for the sovereignty of Parliament, formerly moved to have read at your table, in confirmation of his tenets. It is true that Lord Chatham considered these preambles as declaring strongly in favour of his opinions. He was a no less powerful advocate for the privileges of the Americans. Ought I not from hence to presume that these preambles are as favourable as possible to both, when properly understood; favourable both to the rights of Parliament and to the privilege of the dependencies of this crown? But, sir, the object of grievance in my resolution I have not taken from the Chester, but from the Durham Act, which confines the hardship of want of representation to the case of subsidies, and which, therefore, falls in exactly with the case of the colonies. But whether the unrepresented counties were *de jure* or *de facto* bound, the preambles do not accurately distinguish, nor indeed was it necessary; for, whether *de jure* or *de facto*, the Legislature thought the exercise of the power of taxing, as of right, or as of fact without right, equally a grievance, and equally oppressive.

* The Solicitor-General informed Mr B., when the resolutions were separately moved, that the grievance of the judges partaking of the profits of the seizure had been redressed by office; accordingly, the resolution was amended.

I do not know that the colonies have, in any general way or in any cool hour, gone much beyond the demand of immunity in relation to taxes. It is not fair to judge of the temper or dispositions of any man, or any set of men, when they are composed and at rest, from their conduct or their expressions in a state of disturbance and irritation. It is, besides, a very great mistake to imagine that mankind follow up practically any speculative principle, either of government or freedom, as far as it will go in argument and logical illation. We Englishmen stop very short of the principles upon which we support any given part of our Constitution, or even the whole of it together. I could easily, if I had not already tired you, give you very striking and convincing instances of it. This is nothing but what is natural and proper. All government, indeed every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent Act, is founded on compromise and barter. We balance inconveniences; we give and take, we remit some rights that we may enjoy others, and we choose rather to be happy citizens than subtle disputants. As we must give away some natural liberty to enjoy civil advantages, so we must sacrifice some civil liberties for the advantages to be derived from the communion and fellowship of a great empire. But, in all fair dealings, the thing bought must bear some proportion to the purchase paid. None will barter away "the immediate jewel of his soul."* Though a great house is apt to make slaves haughty, yet it is purchasing a part of the artificial importance of a great empire too dear to pay for it all essential rights and all the intrinsic dignity of human nature. None of us who would not risk his life rather than fall under a government purely arbitrary. But, although there are some among us who think our Constitution wants many improvements to make it a complete system of liberty, perhaps none who are of that opinion would think it right to aim at such improvement by disturbing his country, and risking everything that is dear to him. In every arduous enterprise we consider what we are to lose as well as what we are to gain; and the more and better stake of liberty every people possess, the less they will hazard in a vain attempt to make it more. These are *the cords of man.* Man acts from adequate motives relative to his interest, and not on metaphysical speculations. Aristotle, the great master of reasoning, cautions us, and with great weight and propriety, against this species of delusive geometrical accuracy in moral arguments as the most fallacious of all sophistry.

The Americans will have no interest contrary to the grandeur and glory of England, when they are not oppressed by the weight of it; and they will rather be inclined to respect the Acts of a superintending Legislature, when they see them the Acts of that power which is itself the security, not the rival, of their secondary importance. In this assurance my mind most perfectly acquiesces, and I confess I feel not the least alarm from the discontents which are to arise from putting people at their ease; nor do I apprehend the destruction of this empire from giving, by an act of free grace and indulgence, to two millions of my fellow-citizens, some share of those rights upon which I have always been taught to value myself.

It is said, indeed, that this power of granting, vested in American assemblies, would dissolve the unity of the empire, which was preserved entire, although Wales, and Chester, and Durham were added to it. Truly, Mr Speaker, I do not know what this unity means, nor has it ever been heard of, that I know, in the constitutional policy of this country. The very idea of subordination of parts excludes this notion of simple and undivided unity. England is the head, but she is not the head and the members too. Ireland has ever had from the beginning a separate, but not an independent legislature, which, far from distracting, promoted the union of the whole. Every thing was sweetly and harmoniously disposed through both islands for the conservation of English dominion and the communication of English liberties. I do not see that the same principles might not be carried into twenty islands, and with the same good effect. This is my model with regard to America, as far as the internal circumstances of the two countries are the same. I know no other unity of this empire than I can draw from its example during these periods, when it seemed to my poor understanding more united than it is now, or than it is likely to be by the present methods.

But since I speak of these methods, I recollect, Mr Speaker, almost too late, that I promised, before I finished, to say something of the proposition of the noble lord [Lord North] on the floor, which has been so lately received, and stands on your journals. I must be deeply concerned whenever it is my misfortune to continue a difference with a majority of this House. But as the reasons for that difference are my apology for thus troubling you, suffer me to state them in a very few words. I shall compress them into as small a body as I possibly can, having already debated that matter at large when the question was before the committee.

First, then, I cannot admit that proposition of a ransom by auction, because it is a mere project. It is a thing new; unheard of; supported by no experience; justified by no analogy; without example of our ancestors, or root in the Constitution. It is neither regular parliamentary taxation nor colony grant. "Experimentum in corpore vili" (an experiment should

---

* "Good name in man and woman, dear my lord,
Is the immediate jewel of their souls."
—*Othello*, Act iii., Sc. 5.

be made upon some worthless object) is a good rule, which will ever make me adverse to any trial of experiments on what is certainly the most valuable of all subjects, the peace of this empire.

Secondly, it is an experiment which must be fatal, in the end, to our Constitution. For what is it but a scheme for taxing the colonies in the ante-chamber of the noble lord and his successors? To settle the quotas and proportions in this House is clearly impossible. You, sir, may flatter yourself you shall sit a state auctioneer, with your hammer in your hand, and knock down to each colony as it bids. But to settle (on the plan laid down by the noble lord) the true proportional payment for four or five-and-twenty governments, according to the absolute and the relative wealth of each, and according to the British proportion of wealth and burden, is a wild and chimerical notion. This new taxation must therefore come in by the back door of the Constitution. Each quota must be brought to this House ready formed; you can neither add nor alter. You must register it. You can do nothing farther. For on what grounds can you deliberate, either before or after the proposition? You cannot hear the counsel for all these provinces, quarreling each on its own quantity of payment, and its proportion to others. If you should attempt it, the committee of provincial ways and means, or by whatever other name it will delight to be called, must swallow up all the time of Parliament.

Thirdly, it does not give satisfaction to the complaint of the colonies. They complain that they are taxed without their consent; you answer, that you will fix the sum at which they shall be taxed. That is, you give them the very grievance for the remedy. You tell them, indeed, that you will leave the mode to themselves. I really beg pardon. It gives me pain to mention it; but you must be sensible that you will *not perform* this part of the contract. For, suppose the colonies were to lay the duties which furnished their contingent upon the importation of your manufactures; you know you would never suffer such a tax to be laid. You know, too, that you would not suffer many other modes of taxation; so that, when you come to explain yourself, it will be found that you will neither leave to themselves the quantum nor the mode, nor, indeed, anything. The whole is a delusion from one end to the other.

Fourthly, this method of ransom by auction, unless it be *universally* accepted, will plunge you into great and inextricable difficulties. In what year of our Lord are the proportions of payments to be settled, to say nothing of the impossibility, that colony agents should have general powers of taxing the colonies at their discretion? Consider, I implore you, that the communication by special messages, and orders between these agents and their constituents on each variation of the case, when the parties come to contend together, and to dispute on their relative proportions, will be a matter of delay, perplexity, and confusion that never can have an end.

If all the colonies do not appear at the outcry, what is the condition of those assemblies, who offer, by themselves or their agents, to tax themselves up to your ideas of their proportion? The refractory colonies who refuse all composition will remain taxed only to your old impositions, which, however grievous in principle, are trifling as to production. The obedient colonies in this scheme are heavily taxed; the refractory remain unburdened. What will you do? Will you lay new and heavier taxes by Parliament on the disobedient? Pray consider in what way you can do it. You are perfectly convinced that in the way of taxing you can do nothing but at the ports. Now suppose it is Virginia that refuses to appear at your auction, while Maryland and North Carolina bid handsomely for their ransom, and are taxed to your quota. How will you put these colonies on a par? Will you tax the tobacco of Virginia? If you do, you give its death wound to your English revenue at home, and to one of the very greatest articles of your own foreign trade. If you tax the import of that rebellious colony, what do you tax but your own manufactures, or the goods of some other obedient and already well-taxed colony? Who has said one word on this labyrinth of detail, which bewilders you more and more as you enter into it? Who has presented, who can present you with a clew to lead you out of it? I think, sir, it is impossible that you should not recollect that the colony bounds are so implicated in one another (you know it by your own experiments in the bill for prohibiting the New England fishery), that you can lay no possible restraints on almost any of them which may not be presently eluded, if you do not confound the innocent with the guilty, and burden those whom, upon every principle, you ought to exonerate. He must be grossly ignorant of America who thinks that, without falling into this confusion of all rules of equity and policy, you can restrain any single colony, especially Virginia and Maryland, the central and most important of them all.

Let it also be considered, that either in the present confusion you settle a permanent contingent which will and must be trifling, and then you have no effectual revenue; or, you change the quota at every exigency, and then on every new reparation you will have a new quarrel.

Reflect, besides, that when you have fixed a quota for every colony, you have not provided for prompt and punctual payment. Suppose one, two, five, ten years arrears. You cannot issue a treasury extent against the failing colony. You must make new Boston Port bills, new

restraining laws, new acts for dragging men to England for trial. You must send out new fleets, new armies. All is to begin again. From this day forward the empire is never to know an hour's tranquillity. An intestine fire will be kept alive in the bowels of the colonies, which one time or other must consume this whole empire. I allow, indeed, that the empire of Germany raises her revenue and her troops by quotas and contingents; but the revenue of the Empire, and the army of the Empire, is the worst revenue and the worst army in the world.

Instead of a standing revenue, you will therefore have a perpetual quarrel. Indeed, the noble lord, who proposed this project of a ransom by auction, seemed himself to be of that opinion. His project was rather designed for breaking the union of the colonies than for establishing a revenue. He confessed that he apprehended that his proposal would not be to *their taste.* I say this scheme of disunion seems to be at the bottom of the project; for I will not suspect that the noble lord meant nothing but merely to delude the nation by an airy phantom which he never intended to realize. But, whatever his views may be, as I propose the peace and union of the colonies as the very foundation of my plan, it cannot accord with one whose foundation is perpetual discord.

Compare the two. This I offer to give you is plain and simple. The other full of perplexed and intricate mazes. This is mild; that harsh. This is found by experience effectual for its purposes; the other is a new project. This is universal; the other calculated for certain colonies only. This is immediate in its conciliatory operation; the other remote, contingent, full of hazard. Mine is what becomes the dignity of a ruling people; gratuitous, unconditional, and not held out as matter of bargain and sale. I have done my duty in proposing it to you. I have indeed tired you by a long discourse; but this is the misfortune of those to whose influence nothing will be conceded, and who must win every inch of their ground by argument. You have heard me with goodness. May you decide with wisdom! For my part, I feel my mind greatly disburdened by what I have done to-day. I have been the less fearful of trying your patience, because on this subject I mean to spare it altogether in future. I have this comfort, that in every stage of the American affairs, I have steadily opposed the measures that have produced the confusion, and may bring on the destruction of this empire. I now go so far as to risk a proposal of my own. If I cannnot give peace to my country, I give it to my conscience.

But what, says the financier, is peace to us without money? Your plan gives us no revenue? No! But it does. For it secures to the subject the power of *refusal*—the first of all revenues. Experience is a cheat, and fact a liar, if this power in the subject of proportioning his grant, or of not granting at all, has not been found the richest mine of revenue ever discovered by the skill or by the fortune of man. It does not indeed vote you £152,750, 11s. 2¾d., nor any other paltry limited sum, but it gives the strong box itself, the fund, the bank, from whence only revenues can arise among a people sensible of freedom: *Posita luditur area.** Can not you in England; can not you at this time of day; can not you—a House of Commons—trust to the principle which has raised so mighty a revenue, and accumulated a debt of near one hundred and forty millions in this country? Is this principle to be true in England and false everywhere else? Is it not true in Ireland? Has it not hitherto been true in the colonies? Why should you presume, that in any country, a body duly constituted for any functions will neglect to perform its duty, and abdicate its trust? Such a presumption would go against all government in all modes. But, in truth, this dread of penury of supply, from a free assembly, has no foundation in nature. For first observe, that, besides the desire, which all men have naturally, of supporting the honour of their own government, that sense of dignity, and that security of property, which ever attends freedom, has a tendency to increase the stock of the free community. Most may be taken where most is accumulated. And what is the soil or climate where experience has not uniformly proved that the voluntary flow of heaped-up plenty, bursting from the weight of its own rich luxuriance, has ever run with a more copious stream of revenue, than could be squeezed from the dry husks of oppressed indigence, by the straining of all the politic machinery in the world?

Next, we know that parties must ever exist in a free country. We know, too, that the emulations of such parties, their contradictions, their reciprocal necessities, their hopes, and their fears, must send them all in their turns to him that holds the balance of the state. The parties are the gamesters, but government keeps the table, and is sure to be the winner in the end. When this game is played, I really think it is more to be feared that the people will be exhausted, than that government will not be supplied; whereas, whatever is got by acts of absolute power, ill obeyed, because odious, or by contracts ill kept, because constrained, will be narrow, feeble, uncertain, and precarious.

"Ease would retract
Vows made in pain, as violent and void."—*Milton.*

I, for one, protest against compounding our demands. I declare against compounding, for a poor limited sum, the immense, ever-growing, eternal debt, which is due to generous govern-

* "For now no more the pocket's stores supply
The boundless charges of the desperate die;
The chest is staked!"—*Gifford's Juvenal.*

ment from protected freedom. And so may I speed in the great object I propose to you, as I think it would not only be an act of injustice, but would be the worst economy in the world, to compel the colonies to a sum certain, either in the way of ransom or in the way of compulsory compact.

But to clear up my ideas on this subject: a revenue from America transmitted hither—do not delude yourselves—you never can receive it—no, not a shilling. We have experience that from remote countries it is not to be expected. If, when you attempted to extract revenue from Bengal, you were obliged to return in loan what you had taken in imposition, what can you expect from North America? for certainly, if ever there was a country qualified to produce wealth, it is India; or an institution fit for the transmission, it is the East India Company. America has none of these aptitudes. If America gives you taxable objects on which you lay your duties *here*, and gives you, at the same time, a surplus by a foreign sale of her commodities to pay the duties on these objects which you tax at home, she has performed her part to the British revenue. But with regard to her own internal establishments, she may, I doubt not she will, contribute in moderation; I say in moderation, for she ought not to be permitted to exhaust herself. She ought to be reserved to a war, the weight of which, with the enemies that we are most likely to have, must be considerable in her quarter of the globe. There she may serve you, and serve you essentially.

For that service, for all service, whether of revenue, trade, or empire, my trust is in her interest in the British constitution. My hold of the colonies is in the close affection which grows from common names, from kindred blood, from similar privileges, and equal protection. These are ties which, though light as air, are as strong as links of iron. Let the colonies always keep the idea of their civil rights associated with your government; they will cling and grapple to you, and no force under heaven will be of power to tear them from their allegiance. But let it be once understood that your government may be one thing, and their privileges another; that these two things may exist without any mutual relation; the cement is gone; the cohesion is loosened; and everything hastens to decay and dissolution. As long as you have the wisdom to keep the sovereign authority of this country as the sanctuary of liberty, the sacred temple consecrated to our common faith, wherever the chosen race and sons of England worship Freedom, they will turn their faces toward you.* The more they multiply, the more friends you will have. The more ardently they love liberty, the more perfect will be their obedience. Slavery they can have anywhere. It is a weed that grows in every soil. They may have it from Spain; they may have it from Prussia; but, until you become lost to all feeling of your true interest and your natural dignity, freedom they can have from none but you. This is the commodity of price, of which you have the monopoly. This is the true Act of Navigation, which binds to you the commerce of the colonies, and through them secures to you the wealth of the world. Deny them this participation of freedom, and you break that sole bond which originally made, and must still preserve, the unity of the empire. Do not entertain so weak an imagination as that your registers and your bonds, your affidavits and your sufferances, your cockets and your clearances, are what form the great securities of your commerce. Do not dream that your letters of office, and your instructions, and your suspending clauses, are the things that hold together the great contexture of this mysterious whole. These things do not make your government. Dead instruments, passive tools as they are, it is the spirit of the English communion that gives all their life and efficacy to them. It is the spirit of the English constitution, which, infused through the mighty mass, pervades, feeds, unites, invigorates, vivifies every part of the empire, even down to the minutest member.

Is it not the same virtue which does everything for us here in England? Do you imagine, then, that it is the land tax which raises your revenue? that it is the annual vote in the Committee of Supply which gives you your army? or that it is the Mutiny Bill which inspires it with bravery and discipline? No! surely no! It is the love of the people; it is their attachment to their Government, from the sense of the deep stake they have in such a glorious institution, which gives you your army and your navy, and infuses into both that liberal obedience, without which your army would be a base rabble, and your navy nothing but rotten timber.

All this, I know well enough, will sound wild and chimerical to the profane herd of those vulgar and mechanical politicians, who have no place among us; a sort of people who think that nothing exists but what is gross and material, and who therefore, far from being qualified to be directors of the great movement of empire, are not fit to turn a wheel in the machine. But to men truly initiated and rightly taught, these ruling and master principles, which, in the opinion of such men as I have mentioned, have no substantial existence, are in truth everything and all in all. Magnanimity in politics is not seldom the truest wisdom; and a great empire and little minds go ill together. If we are conscious of our situation, and glow with zeal to fill our place as becomes our station and ourselves, we ought to auspicate all our public

* An allusion suggested by the practice of the Jews worshipping towards the temple during their dispersions (*vide* 1 Kings viii. 44-45; Dan. vi. 10).

proceedings on America with the old warning of the Church, *Sursum corda!** We ought to elevate our minds to the greatness of that trust to which the order of Providence has called us. By adverting to the dignity of this high calling, our ancestors have turned a savage wilderness into a glorious empire, and have made the most extensive and the only honourable conquests, not by destroying, but by promoting, the wealth, the number, the happiness of the human race. Let us get an American revenue as we have got an American empire. English privileges have made it all that it is; English privileges alone will make it all it can be.

In full confidence of this unalterable truth, I now (*quod felix faustumque sit*)† lay the first stone in the temple of peace; and I move you—

"That the colonies and plantations of Great Britain in North America, consisting of fourteen separate governments, and containing two millions and upwards of free inhabitants, have not had the liberty and privilege of electing and sending any knights and burgesses, or others, to represent them in the high court of Parliament."

[On this resolution the previous question was demanded, and was carried against Mr Burke by a majority of 270 to 78. The other resolutions, as a matter of course, fell to the ground.]

SPEECH PREVIOUS TO BRISTOL ELECTION.‡

["The morality," says the Rev. F. D. Maurice, in a lecture on Burke, "which he had enforced in his speeches during the American War, he was called to exhibit in his own case, in the year 1780, when he appeared before his constituents of the city of Bristol to explain his conduct to them, and to ask for a renewal of their confidence. . . . He had given them this notice of the principle upon which he intended to act; but, as might have been expected, when he did act upon it they were offended. He had injured their trade, the merchants of Bristol thought, by his votes on the American War, and by supporting an Act for relieving debtors from the cruel imprisonment to which they were then subjected, and by some important measures connected with Ireland. He had offended their prejudices in other ways, and he had been too busy in his Parliamentary work to pay them as many visits as they had supposed were due from a representative. . . . But he made his completest defence in a speech delivered just before the election. That speech, I do think, was the bravest and the wisest ever addressed to an assembly of Englishmen. Would that our younger statesmen might read it again and again, till they have, in the true sense of the phrase, learnt it by heart."]

Mr Mayor and Gentlemen,—I am extremely pleased at the appearance of this large and respectable meeting. The steps I may be obliged to take will want the sanction of a considerable authority; and in explaining anything which may appear doubtful in my public conduct, I must naturally desire a very full audience.

I have been backward to begin my canvass. The dissolution of the Parliament was uncertain; and it did not become me, by an unseasonable importunity, to appear diffident of the fact of my six years' endeavours to please you. I had served the city of Bristol honourably; and the city of Bristol had no reason to think that the means of honourable service to the public were become indifferent to me.

I found, on my arrival here, that three gentlemen had been long in eager pursuit of an object which but two of us can obtain. I found that they had all met with encouragement. A contested election in such a city as this is no light thing. I paused on the brink of the precipice. These three gentlemen, by various merits, and on various titles, I made no doubt, were worthy of your favour. I shall never attempt to raise myself by depreciating the merits of my competitors. In the complexity and confusion of these cross pursuits, I wished to take the authentic public sense of my friends upon a business of so much delicacy. I wished to take your opinion along with me; that if I should give up the contest at the very beginning, my surrender of my post may not seem the effect of inconstancy, or timidity, or anger, or disgust, or indolence, or any other temper unbecoming a man who has engaged in the public service. If, on the contrary, I should undertake the election, and fail of success, I was full as anxious that it should be manifest to the whole world that the peace of the city had not been broken by my rashness, presumption, or fond conceit of my own merit.

I am not come, by a false and counterfeit show of deference to your judgment, to seduce it in my favour. I ask it seriously and unaffectedly. If you wish that I should retire, I shall not consider that advice as a censure upon my conduct, or an alteration in your sentiments, but as a rational submission to the circumstances of affairs. If, on the contrary, you should think it proper for me to proceed on my canvass, if you will risk the trouble on your part, I will risk it on mine. My pretensions are such as you cannot be ashamed of, whether they succeed or fail.

If you call upon me, I shall solicit the favour

---

* "Let your hearts rise upward," a call to silent prayer, at certain intervals of the Roman Catholic service.

† A form of prayer among the Romans at the beginning of any great undertaking, "that it may be happy and prosperous."

‡ Delivered September 6, 1780.

of the city upon manly ground. I come before you with the plain confidence of an honest servant in the equity of a candid and discerning master. I come to claim your approbation, not to amuse you with vain apologies, or with professions still more vain and senseless. I have lived too long to be served by apologies, or to stand in need of them. The part I have acted has been in open day; and to hold out to a conduct which stands in that clear and steady light for all its good and all its evil, to hold out to that conduct the paltry winking tapers of excuses and promises, I never will do it. They may obscure it with their smoke, but they never can illumine sunshine by such a flame as theirs.

I am sensible that no endeavours have been left untried to injure me in your opinion. But the *use of character is to be a shield against calumny.* I could wish, undoubtedly (if idle wishes were not the most idle of all things), to make every part of my conduct agreeable to every one of my constituents. But in so great a city, and so greatly divided as this, it is weak to expect it. In such a discordancy of sentiments, it is better to look to the nature of things than to the humours of men. The very attempt toward pleasing everybody, discovers a temper always flashy, and often false and insincere. Therefore, as I have proceeded straight onward in my conduct, so I will proceed in my account of those parts of it which have been most excepted to. But I must first beg leave just to hint to you, that we may suffer very great detriment by being open to every talker. It is not to be imagined how much of service is lost from spirits full of activity and full of energy, who are pressing, who are rushing forward to great and capital objects, when you oblige them to be continually looking back. While they are defending one service, they defraud you of a hundred. Applaud us when we run; console us when we fall; cheer us when we recover; but let us pass on—for God's sake, let us pass on.

Do you think, gentlemen, that every public act in the six years since I stood in this place before you—that all the arduous things which have been done in this eventful period, which has crowded into a few years' space the revolutions of an age, can be opened to you on their fair grounds in half an hour's conversation?

But it is no reason, because there is a bad mode of inquiry, that there should be no examination at all. Most certainly it is our duty to examine; it is our interest too. But it must be with discretion; with an attention to all the circumstances, and to all the motives; like sound judges, and not like caviling pettifoggers and quibbling pleaders, prying into flaws and hunting for exceptions. Look, gentlemen, to the *whole tenor* of your member's conduct. Try whether his ambition or his avarice have justled him out of the straight line of duty, or whether that grand foe of the offices of active life—that master-vice in men of business, a degenerate and inglorious sloth—has made him flag, and languish in his course. This is the object of our inquiry. If our member's conduct can bear this touch, mark it for sterling. He may have fallen into errors; he must have faults; but our error is greater, and our fault is radically ruinous to ourselves, if we do not bear, if we do not even applaud the whole compound and mixed mass of such a character. Not to act thus is folly; I had almost said it is impiety. *He censures God who quarrels with the imperfections of man.*

Gentlemen, we must not be peevish with those who serve the people, for none will serve us while there is a court to serve, but those who are of a nice and jealous honour. They who think everything, in comparison of that honour, to be dust and ashes, will not bear to have it soiled and impaired by those for whose sake they make a thousand sacrifices to preserve it immaculate and whole. We shall either drive such men from the public stage, or we shall send them to the court for protection, where, if they must sacrifice their reputation, they will at least secure their interest. Depend upon it, that the lovers of freedom will be free. None will violate their conscience to please us in order afterward to discharge that conscience which they have violated by doing us faithful and affectionate service. If we degrade and deprave their minds by servility, it will be absurd to expect that they who are creeping and abject toward us will ever be bold and incorruptible asserters of our freedom against the most seducing and the most formidable of all powers. No! Human nature is not so formed, nor shall we improve the faculties or better the morals of public men by our possession of the most infallible receipt in the world for making cheats and hypocrites.

Let me say with plainness, I, who am no longer in a public character, that if by a fair, by an indulgent, by a gentlemanly behaviour to our representatives, we do not give confidence to their minds and a liberal scope to their understandings; if we do not permit our members to act upon a *very* enlarged view of things, we shall at length infallibly degrade our national representation into a confused and shuffling bustle of local agency. When the popular member is narrowed in his ideas, and rendered timid in his proceedings, the service of the Crown will be the sole nursery of statesmen. Among the frolics of the court, it may at length take that of attending to its business. Then the monopoly of mental power will be added to the power of all other kinds it possesses. On the side of the people there will be nothing but impotence, for ignorance is impotence, narrowness of mind is impotence, timidity is itself impotence, and makes all other qualities that go along with it impotent and useless.

At present it is the plan of the court to make

its servants insignificant. If the people should fall into the same humour, and should choose their servants on the same principles of mere obsequiousness and flexibility, and total vacancy or indifference of opinion in all public matters, then no part of the state will be sound, and it will be in vain to think of saving it.

I thought it very expedient at this time to give you this candid counsel; and with this counsel I would willingly close, if the matters which at various times have been objected to me in this city concerned only myself and my own election. These charges, I think, are four in number: my neglect of a due attention to my constituents, the not paying more frequent visits here; my conduct on the affairs of the first Irish Trade Acts; my opinion and mode of proceeding on Lord Beauchamp's debtors' bills; and my votes on the late affairs of the Roman Catholics. All of these (except, perhaps, the first) relate to matters of very considerable public concern; and it is not lest you should censure me improperly, but lest you should form improper opinions on matters of some moment to you, that I trouble you at all upon the subject. My conduct is of small importance.

I. With regard to the first charge, my friends have spoken to me of it in the style of amicable expostulation; not so much blaming the thing, as lamenting the effects. Others, less partial to me, were less kind in assigning the motives. I admit there is a decorum and propriety in a Member of Parliament's paying a respectful court to his constituents. If I were conscious to myself that pleasure or dissipation, or low, unworthy occupations had detained me from personal attendance on you, I would readily admit my fault, and quietly submit to the penalty. But, gentlemen, I live a hundred miles distance from Bristol; and at the end of a session I come to my own house, fatigued in body and in mind, to a little repose, and to a very little attention to my family and my private concerns. A visit to Bristol is always a sort of canvass, else it will do more harm than good. To pass from the toils of a session to the toils of a canvass is the furthest thing in the world from repose. I could hardly serve you as I have done, and court you too. Most of you have heard that I do not very remarkably spare myself in public business, and in the *private* business of my constituents I have done very near as much as those who have nothing else to do. My canvass of you was not on the 'change, nor in the county meetings, nor in the clubs of this city. It was in the House of Commons, it was at the Custom-house, it was at the Council, it was at the Treasury, it was at the Admiralty. I canvassed you through your affairs, and not your persons. I was not only your representative as a body; I was the agent, the solicitor of individuals. I ran about wherever your affairs could call me; and in acting for you, I often appeared rather as a shipbroker than as a Member of Parliament. There was nothing too laborious or too low for me to undertake. The meanness of the business was raised by the dignity of the object. If some lesser matters have slipped through my fingers, it was because I filled my hands too full, and, in my eagerness to serve you, took in more than my hands could grasp. Several gentlemen stand round me who are my willing witnesses, and there are others who, if they were here, would be still better, because they would be unwilling witnesses to the same truth. It was in the middle of a summer residence in London, and in the middle of a negotiation at the Admiralty for your trade, that I was called to Bristol; and this late visit, at this late day, has been possibly in prejudice to your affairs.

Since I have touched upon this matter, let me say, gentlemen, that if I had a disposition or a right to complain, I have some cause of complaint on my side. With a petition of this city in my hand, passed through the corporation without a dissenting voice, a petition in unison with almost the whole voice of the kingdom (with whose formal thanks I was covered over), while I laboured on no less than five bills for a public reform,* and fought against the opposition of great abilities, and of the greatest power, every clause, and every word of the largest of those bills, almost to the very last day of a very long session—all this time a canvass in Bristol was as calmly carried on as if I were dead. I was considered as a man wholly out of the question. While I watched, and fasted, and sweated in the House of Commons, by the most easy and ordinary arts of election, by dinners and visits, by "How-do-you-dos" and "My worthy friends," I was to be quietly moved out of my seat; and promises were made, and engagements entered into, without any exception or reserve, as if my laborious zeal in my duty had been a regular abdication of my trust.

To open my whole heart to you on this subject, I do confess, however, that there were other times besides the two years in which I did visit you, when I was not wholly without leisure for repeating that mark of my respect; but I could not bring my mind to see you. You remember that in the beginning of this American war (that era of calamity, disgrace, and downfall—an era which no feeling mind will ever mention without a tear for England) you were greatly divided; and a very strong body, if not the strongest, opposed itself to the madness which every art and every power were employed to render popular, in order that the errors of the rulers might be lost in the general blindness of

* Burke here refers to his bills for economical reform, which were advocated in his speech on this subject, delivered 11th February 1780.

the nation. This opposition continued until after our great, but most unfortunate victory at Long Island.* Then all the mounds and banks of our constancy were borne down at once, and the frenzy of the American war broke in upon us like a deluge. This victory, which seemed to put an immediate end to all difficulties, perfected in us that spirit of domination which our unparalleled prosperity had but too long nurtured. We had been so very powerful, and so very prosperous, that even the humblest of us were degraded into the vices and follies of kings. We lost all measure between means and ends; and our headlong desires became our politics and our morals. All men who wished for peace, or retained any sentiments of moderation, were overborne or silenced; and this city was led by every artifice (and probably with more management, because I was one of your members) to distinguish itself by its zeal for that fatal cause. In this temper of yours and of my mind, I should have sooner fled to the extremities of the earth than have shown myself here. I, who saw in every American victory (for you have had a long series of these misfortunes) the germ and seed of the naval power of France and Spain, which all our heat and warmth against America was only hatching into life—I should not have been a welcome visitant with the brow and the language of such feelings. When afterward the other face of your calamity was turned upon you, and showed itself in defeat and distress, I shunned you full as much. I felt sorely this variety in our wretchedness, and I did not wish to have the least appearance of insulting you with that show of superiority which, though it may not be assumed, is generally suspected in a time of calamity from those whose previous warnings have been despised. I could not bear to show you a representative whose face did not reflect that of his constituents; a face that could not joy in your joys and sorrow in your sorrows. But time at length has made us all of one opinion; and we have all opened our eyes on the true nature of the American war, to the true nature of all its successes and all its failures.

In that public storm, too, I had my private feelings. I had seen blown down and prostrate on the ground several of those houses to whom I was chiefly indebted for the honour this city has done me. I confess, that while the wounds of those I loved were yet green, I could not bear to show myself in pride and triumph in that place into which their partiality had brought me, and to appear at feasts and rejoicings, in the midst of the grief and calamity of my warm friends, my zealous supporters, my generous benefactors. This is a true, unvarnished, undisguised state of the affair. You will judge of it.

* In August 1776, when the army under Washington was defeated, and New York taken by the British.

This is the only one of the charges in which I am personally concerned. As to the other matters objected against me, which in their turn I shall mention to you, remember once more I do not mean to extenuate or excuse. Why should I, when the things charged are among those upon which I found all my reputation? What would be left to me, if I myself was the man who softened, and blended, and diluted, and weakened, all the distinguishing colours of my life, so as to leave nothing distinct and determinate in my whole conduct?

II. It has been said, and it is the second charge, that in the questions of the Irish trade I did not consult the interest of my constituents, or, to speak out strongly, that I rather acted as a native of Ireland, than as an English Member of Parliament.

I certainly have very warm, good wishes, for the place of my birth. But the sphere of my duties is my true country. It was as a man attached to your interests, and zealous for the conservation of your power and dignity, that I acted on that occasion, and on all occasions. You were involved in the American war. A new world of policy was opened, to which it was necessary we should conform, whether we would or not; and my only thought was how to conform to our situation in such a manner as to unite to this kingdom, in prosperity and in affection, whatever remained of the empire. I was true to my old, standing, invariable principle, that all things which came from Great Britain should issue as a gift of her bounty and beneficence, rather than as claims recovered against a struggling litigant; or at least, that if your beneficence obtained no credit in your concessions, yet that they should appear the salutary provisions of your wisdom and foresight; not as things wrung from you with your blood, by the cruel gripe of a rigid necessity. The first concessions, by being (much against my will) mangled and stripped of the parts which were necessary to make out their just correspondence and connection in trade, were of no use. The next year a feeble attempt was made to bring the thing into better shape. This attempt (countenanced by the Minister), on the very first appearance of some popular uneasiness, was, after a considerable progress through the House, thrown out by *him*.

What was the consequence? The whole kingdom of Ireland was instantly in a flame. Threatened by foreigners, and, as they thought, insulted by England, they resolved at once to resist the power of France, and to cast off yours. As for us, we were able neither to protect nor to restrain them. Forty thousand men were raised and disciplined without commission from the Crown. Two illegal armies were seen with banners displayed at the same time, and in the same country. No executive magistrate, no judicature in Ireland, would acknowledge the legality

of the army which bore the king's commission; and no law, or appearance of law, authorised the army commissioned by itself. In this unexampled state of things, which the least error, the least trespass on the right or left, would have hurried down the precipice into an abyss of blood and confusion, the people of Ireland demand a freedom of trade with arms in their hands. They interdict all commerce between the two nations. They deny all new supply in the House of Commons, although in time of war. They stint the trust of the old revenue, given for two years to all the king's predecessors, to six months. The British Parliament, in a former session frightened into a limited concession by the menaces of Ireland, frightened out of it by the menaces of England, was now frightened back again, and made a universal surrender of all that had been thought the peculiar, reserved, uncommunicable rights of England—the exclusive commerce of America, of Africa, of the West Indies—all the enumerations of the Acts of Navigation—all the manufactures, iron, glass, even the last pledge of jealousy and pride, the interest hid in the secret of our hearts, the inveterate prejudice moulded into the constitution of our frame, even the sacred fleece itself, all went together. No reserve, no exception, no debate, no discussion. A sudden light broke in upon us all. It broke in, not through well-contrived and well-disposed windows, but through flaws and breaches; through the yawning chasms of our ruin. We were taught wisdom by humiliation. No town in England presumed to have a prejudice, or dared to mutter a petition. What was worse, the whole Parliament of England, which retained authority for nothing but surrenders, was despoiled of every shadow of superintendence. It was, without any qualification, denied in theory, as it had been trampled upon in practice. This scene of shame and disgrace has, in a manner while I am speaking, ended by the perpetual establishment of military power, in the dominions of this Crown, without consent of the British legislature, contrary to the policy of the constitution, contrary to the declaration of right; and by this your liberties are swept away along with your supreme authority—and both, linked together from the beginning, have, I am afraid, both together perished for ever.

What, gentlemen, was I not to foresee, or, foreseeing, was I not to endeavour to save you from all these multiplied mischiefs and disgraces? Would the little, silly, canvass prattle of obeying instructions, and having no opinions but yours, and such idle, senseless tales, which amuse the vacant ears of unthinking men, have saved you from "that pelting of the pitiless storm," to which the loose improvidence, the cowardly rashness of those who dare not look danger in the face, so as to provide against it in time, and therefore throw themselves headlong into the midst of it, have exposed this degraded nation, beat down and prostrate on the earth, unsheltered, unarmed, unresisting? Was I an Irishman on that day, that I boldly withstood our pride? or on the day that I hung down my head, and wept in shame and silence over the humiliation of Great Britain? I became unpopular in England for the one, and in Ireland for the other. What then? What obligation lay on me to be popular? I was bound to serve both kingdoms. To be pleased with my service was their affair, not mine.

I was an Irishman in the Irish business, just as much as I was an American, when, on the same principles, I wished you to concede to America, at a time when she prayed concession at our feet. Just as much was I an American, when I wished Parliament to offer terms in victory, and not to wait the well-chosen hour of defeat, for making good, by weakness and by supplication, a claim of prerogative, pre-eminence, and authority.

Instead of requiring it from me as a point of duty to kindle with your passions, had you all been as cool as I was, you would have been saved disgraces and distresses that are unutterable. Do you remember our commission? We sent out a solemn embassy across the Atlantic Ocean, to lay the crown, the peerage, the commons of Great Britain, at the feet of the American Congress. That our disgrace might want no sort of brightening and burnishing, observe who they were that composed this famous embassy. My Lord Carlisle is among the first ranks of our nobility. He is the identical man who, but two years before, had been put forward at the opening of a session in the House of Lords, as the mover of a haughty and rigorous address against America. He was put in the front of the embassy of submission. Mr Eden was taken from the office of Lord Suffolk, to whom he was then Under Secretary of State; from the office of that Lord Suffolk, who, but a few weeks before, in his place in Parliament, did not deign to inquire where a congress of vagrants was to be found. This Lord Suffolk sent Mr Eden to find these vagrants, without knowing where his king's generals were to be found, who were joined in the same commission of supplicating those whom they were sent to subdue. They enter the capital of America only to abandon it; and these assertors and representatives of the dignity of England, at the tail of a flying army, let fly their Parthian shafts of memorials and remonstrances at random behind them. Their promises and their offers, their flatteries and their menaces, were all despised; and we were saved the disgrace of their formal reception, only because the Congress scorned to receive them; while the State House of independent Philadelphia opened her doors to the public entry of the ambassador of France. From war and blood we went to submission; and from submission

plunged back again to war and blood; to desolate and be desolated, without measure, hope, or end. I am a Royalist: I blushed for this degradation of the Crown. I am a Whig: I blushed for the dishonour of Parliament. I am a true Englishman: I felt to the quick for the disgrace of England. I am a man: I felt for the melancholy reverse of human affairs, in the fall of the first power in the world.

To read what was approaching in Ireland, in the black and bloody characters of the American war, was a painful, but it was a necessary part of my public duty; for, gentlemen, it is not your fond desires or mine that can alter the nature of things; by contending against which, what have we got, or shall ever get, but defeat and shame? I did not obey your instructions! No, I conformed to the instructions of truth and nature, and maintained your interest against your opinions with a constancy that became me. A representative worthy of you ought to be a person of stability. I am to look, indeed, to your opinions: but to such opinions as you and I *must* have five years hence. I was not to look to the flash of the day: I knew that you chose me, in my place along with others, to be a pillar of the state, and not a weather-cock on the top of the edifice, exalted for my levity and versatility, and of no use but to indicate the shiftings of every fashionable gale. Would to God the value of my sentiments on Ireland and on America had been at this day a subject of doubt and discussion! No matter what my sufferings had been, so that this kingdom had kept the authority I wished it to maintain, by a grave foresight, and by an equitable temperance in the use of its power.

III. The next article of charge on my public conduct, and that which I find rather the most prevalent of all, is Lord Beauchamp's bill.* I mean his bill of last session, for reforming the law process concerning imprisonment. It is said (to aggravate the offence) that I treated the petition of this city with contempt, even in presenting it to the House, and expressed myself in terms of marked disrespect. Had this latter part of the charge been true, no merits on the side of the question which I took could possibly excuse me. But I am incapable of treating this city with disrespect. Very fortunately, at this minute (if my bad eyesight does not deceive me), the worthy gentleman [Mr Williams] deputed on this business, stands directly before me. To him I appeal, whether I did not, though it militated with my oldest and my most recent public opinions, deliver the petition with a strong and more than usual recommendation to the consideration of the House, on account of the character and consequence of those who signed it. I believe the worthy gentleman will tell you, that the very day I received it I applied to the solicitor, now the attorney general, to give it an immediate consideration, and he most obligingly and instantly consented to employ a great deal of his very valuable time to write an explanation of the bill. I attended the committee with all possible care and diligence, in order that every objection of yours might meet with a solution, or produce an alteration. I entreated your learned recorder (always ready in business in which you take a concern) to attend. But what will you say to those who blame me for supporting Lord Beauchamp's bill as a disrespectful treatment of your petition, when you hear that, out of respect to you, I myself was the cause of the loss of that very bill? For the noble lord who brought it in, and who, I must say, has much merit for this and some other measures, at my request consented to put it off for a week, which the speaker's illness lengthened to a fortnight; and then the frantic tumult about popery drove that and every rational business from the House. So that if I chose to make a defence of myself, on the little principles of a culprit, pleading in his exculpation, I might not only secure my acquittal, but make merit with the opposers of the bill. But I shall do no such thing. The truth is, that I did occasion the loss of the bill, and by a delay caused by my respect to you. But such an event was never in my contemplation; and I am so far from taking credit for the defeat of that measure, that I cannot sufficiently lament my misfortune, if but one man who ought to be at large has passed a year in prison by my means. I am a debtor to the debtors; I confess judgment; I own what, if ever it be in my power, I shall most certainly pay—ample atonement, and usurious amends to liberty and humanity for my unhappy lapse. For, gentlemen, Lord Beauchamp's bill was a law of justice and policy, as far as it went; I say as far as it went, for its fault was its being, in the remedial part, miserably defective.

There are two capital faults in our law with relation to civil debts. One is, that every man is presumed solvent: a presumption, in innumerable cases, directly against truth. Therefore the debtor is ordered, on a supposition of ability and fraud, to be coerced his liberty until he makes payment. By this means, in all cases of civil insolvency without a pardon from his

* "This bill (introduced February 10, 1780)," says Mr Goodrich, "allowed an imprisoned debtor, who gave up all his property, and made oath that he was was not worth five pounds in the world, except the bedding of his wife and the clothes of his children, to appear before a court. This court was strictly to investigate the facts, and release him, if they saw fit, from *imprisonment*, though not from his debt, for which his future earnings were still liable. This bill Mr Burke supported. It was lost, however, in the way mentioned above. And yet at Bristol he was overwhelmed with obloquy for giving his countenance to this imperfect measure of justice and humanity, and actually lost his election chiefly on this ground."

creditor, he is to be imprisoned for life; and thus a miserable, mistaken invention of artificial science, operates to change a civil into a criminal judgment, and to scourge misfortune or indiscretion with a punishment which the law does not inflict on the greatest crimes.

The next fault is, that the inflicting of that punishment is not on the opinion of an equal and public judge, but is referred to the arbitrary discretion of a private, nay, interested and irritated individual. He who formally is, and substantially ought to be the judge, is in reality no more than ministerial, a mere executive instrument of a private man, who is at once judge and party. Every idea of judicial order is subverted by this procedure. If the insolvency be no crime, why is it punished with arbitrary imprisonment? If it be a crime, why is it delivered into private hands to pardon without discretion, or to punish without mercy and without measure?

To these faults, gross and cruel faults in our law, the excellent principle of Lord Beauchamp's bill applied some sort of remedy. I know that credit must be preserved, but equity must be preserved too; and it is impossible that anything should be necessary to commerce which is inconsistent with justice. The principle of credit was not weakened by that bill. God forbid! The enforcement of that credit was only put into the same public *judicial* hands on which we depend for our lives and all that makes life dear to us. But, indeed, this business was taken up too warmly, both here and elsewhere. The bill was extremely mistaken. It was supposed to enact what it never enacted; and complaints were made of clauses in it as novelties, which existed before the noble lord that brought in the bill was born. There was a fallacy that ran through the whole of the objections. The gentlemen who opposed the bill always argued as if the option lay between that bill and the ancient law; but this is a grand mistake; for practically the option is between, not that bill and the old law, but between that bill and those occasional laws called "acts of grace." For the operation of the old law is so savage, and so inconvenient to society, that, for a long time past, once in every Parliament, and lately twice, the legislature has been obliged to make a general arbitrary jail delivery, and at once to set open, by its sovereign authority, all the prisons in England.

Gentlemen, I never relished acts of grace, nor ever submitted to them, but from despair of better. They are a dishonourable invention, by which, not from humanity, not from policy, but merely because we have not room enough to hold these victims of the absurdity of our laws, we turn loose upon the public three or four thousand naked wretches, corrupted by the habits, debased by the ignominy of a prison. If the creditor had a right to those carcasses as a natural security for his property, I am sure we have no right to deprive him of that security; but if the few pounds of flesh were not necessary to his security, we had not a right to detain the unfortunate debtor, without any benefit at all to the person who confined him. Take it as you will, we commit injustice. Now Lord Beauchamp's bill intended to do deliberately, and with great caution and circumspection, upon each several case, and with all attention to the just claimant, what acts of grace do in a much greater measure, and with very little care, caution, or deliberation.

I suspect that here, too, if we contrive to oppose this bill, we shall be found in a struggle against the nature of things; for, as we grow enlightened, the public will not bear, for any length of time, to pay for the maintenance of whole armies of prisoners; nor, at their own expense, submit to keep jails as a sort of garrisons, merely to fortify the absurd principle of making men judges in their own cause. For credit has little or no concern in this cruelty. I speak in a commercial assembly. You know that credit is given because capital *must* be employed; that men calculate the chances of insolvency; and they either withhold the credit or make the debtor pay the risk in the price. The counting-house has no alliance with the jail. Holland understands trade as well as we, and she has done much more than this obnoxious bill intended to do. There was not, when Mr Howard visited Holland, more than one prisoner for debt in the great city of Rotterdam. Although Lord Beauchamp's [other] Act (which was previous to this bill, and intended to feel the way for it) has already preserved liberty to thousands, and though it is not three years since the last act of grace passed, yet, by Mr Howard's last account, there were near three thousand again in jail. I cannot name this gentleman without remarking that his labours and writings have done much to open the eyes and hearts of mankind. He has visited all Europe, not to survey the sumptuousness of palaces, or the stateliness of temples; not to make accurate measurements of the remains of ancient grandeur, nor to form a scale of the curiosity of modern art; not to collect medals, or collate manuscripts; but to dive into the depths of dungeons; to plunge into the infection of hospitals; to survey the mansions of sorrow and pain; to take the gage and dimensions of misery, depression, and contempt; to remember the forgotten, to attend to the neglected, to visit the forsaken, and to compare and collate the distresses of all men in all countries. His plan is original, and it is as full of genius as it is of humanity. It was a voyage of discovery; a circumnavigation of charity. Already the benefit of his labour is felt more or less in every country: I hope he will anticipate his final reward, by seeing all its effects fully realised in his own. He will receive, not by re-

tail, but in gross, the reward of those who visit the prisoner; and he has so forestalled and monopolised this branch of charity, that there will be, I trust, little room to merit by such acts of benevolence hereafter.

IV. Nothing now remains to trouble you with but the fourth charge against me—the business of the Roman Catholics. It is a business closely connected with the rest. They are all on one and the same principle. My little scheme of conduct, such as it is, is all arranged. I could do nothing but what I have done on this subject, without confounding the whole train of my ideas and disturbing the whole order of my life. Gentlemen, I ought to apologise to you for seeming to think anything at all necessary to be said upon this matter. The calumny is fitter to be scrawled with the midnight chalk of incendiaries, with "No popery," on walls and doors of devoted houses, than to be mentioned in any civilised company. I had heard that the spirit of discontent on that subject was very prevalent here. With pleasure I find that I have been grossly misinformed. If it exists at all in this city, the laws have crushed its exertions, and our morals have shamed its appearance in daylight. I have pursued this spirit wherever I could trace it, but it still fled from me. It was a ghost which all had heard of, but none had seen. None would acknowledge that he thought the public proceeding with regard to our Catholic Dissenters to be blamable, but several were sorry it had made an ill impression upon others, and that my interest was hurt by my share in the business. I find with satisfaction and pride that not above four or five in this city (and I daresay these misled by some gross misrepresentation) have signed that symbol of delusion and bond of sedition, that libel on the national religion and English character, the Protestant Association. It is, therefore, gentlemen, not by way of cure, but of prevention, and lest the arts of wicked men may prevail over the integrity of any one among us, that I think it necessary to open to you the merits of this transaction pretty much at large; and I beg your patience upon it; for, although the reasonings that have been used to depreciate the act are of little force, and though the authority of the men concerned in this ill design is not very imposing, yet the audaciousness of these conspirators against the national honour, and the extensive wickedness of their attempts, have raised persons of little importance to a degree of evil eminence, and imparted a sort of sinister dignity to proceedings that had their origin in only the meanest and blindest malice.

In explaining to you the proceedings of Parliament which have been complained of, I will state to you, first, the thing that was done; next, the persons who did it; and, lastly, the grounds and reasons upon which the legislature proceeded in this deliberate act of public justice and public prudence.

I. Gentlemen, the condition of our nature is such, that we buy our blessings at a price. The Reformation, one of the greatest periods of human improvement, was a time of trouble and confusion. The vast structure of superstition and tyranny which had been for ages in rearing, and which was combined with the interest of the great and of the many; which was moulded into the laws, the manners, and civil institutions of nations, and blended with the frame and policy of states, could not be brought to the ground without a fearful struggle; nor could it fall without a violent concussion of itself and all about it. When this great revolution was attempted in a more regular mode by Government, it was opposed by plots and seditions of the people; when by popular efforts, it was repressed as rebellion by the hand of power; and bloody executions (often bloodily returned) marked the whole of its progress through all its stages. The affairs of religion, which are no longer heard of in the tumult of our present contentions, made a principal ingredient in the wars and politics of that time; the enthusiasm of religion threw a gloom over the politics, and political interests poisoned and perverted the spirit of religion upon all sides. The Protestant religion, in that violent struggle, infected as the popish had been before, by worldly interests and worldly passions, became a persecutor in its turn, sometimes of the new sects, which carried their own principles further than it was convenient to the original reformers, and always of the body from whom they parted; and this persecuting spirit arose not only from the bitterness of retaliation, but from the merciless policy of fear.

It was long before the spirit of true piety and true wisdom, involved in the principles of reformation, could be depurated from the dregs and feculence of the contention with which it was carried through. However, until this be done, the reformation is not complete; and those that think themselves good Protestants, from their animosity to others, are in that respect no Protestants at all. It was at first thought necessary, perhaps, to oppose to popery another popery, to get the better of it. Whatever was the cause, laws were made in many countries, and in this kingdom in particular, against Papists, which are as bloody as any of those which had been enacted by the popish princes and states; and where those laws were not bloody, in my opinion they were worse, as they were slow, cruel outrages on our nature, and kept men alive only to insult in their persons every one of the rights and feelings of humanity. I pass those statutes, because I would spare your pious ears the repetition of such shocking things; and I come to that particular law, the repeal of which has produced

so many unnatural and unexpected consequences.

A statute was fabricated in the year 1699 by which the saying mass (a church service in the Latin tongue, not exactly the same as our Liturgy, but very near it, and containing no offence whatsoever against the laws or against good morals) was forged into a crime punishable with perpetual imprisonment. The teaching school, a useful and virtuous occupation, even the teaching in a private family, was in every Catholic subjected to the same unproportioned punishment. Your industry and the bread of your children was taxed for a pecuniary reward to stimulate avarice to do what nature refused; to inform and prosecute on this law. Every Roman Catholic was, under the same Act, to forfeit his estate to his nearest Protestant relation, until, through a profession of what he did not believe, he redeemed by his hypocrisy what the law had transferred to the kinsman as the recompense of his profligacy. When thus turned out of doors from his paternal estate, he was disabled from acquiring any other by any industry, donation, or charity, but was rendered a foreigner in his native land, only because he retained the religion along with the property handed down to him from those who had been the old inhabitants of that land before him.

Does any one who hears me approve this scheme of things, or think there is common justice, common sense, or common honesty in any part of it? If any does, let him say it, and I am ready to discuss the point with temper and candour. But instead of approving, I perceive a virtuous indignation beginning to rise in your minds on the mere cold stating of the statute.

But what will you feel when you know from history how this statute passed, and what were the motives, and what the mode of making it? A party in this nation, enemies to the system of the Revolution, were in opposition to the government of King William. They knew that our glorious deliverer was an enemy to all persecution. They knew that he came to free us from slavery and popery out of a country where a third of the people are contented Catholics under a Protestant government. He came, with a part of his army composed of those very Catholics, to overset the power of a popish prince. Such is the effect of a tolerating spirit; and so much is liberty served in every way, and by all persons, by a manly adherence to its own principles. While freedom is true to itself, everything becomes subject to it, and its very adversaries are an instrument in its hands.

The party I speak of (like some among us who would disparage the best friends of their country) resolved to make the king either violate his principles of toleration, or incur the odium of protecting Papists. They therefore brought in this bill, and made it purposely wicked and absurd, that it might be rejected. The then court party, discovering their game, turned the tables on them, and returned their bill to them stuffed with still greater absurdities, that its loss might lie upon its original authors. They, finding their own ball thrown back to them, kicked it back again to their adversaries; and thus this Act, loaded with the double injustice of two parties, *neither of whom intended to pass* what they hoped the other would be persuaded to reject, went through the legislature, contrary to the real wish of all parts of it, and of all the parties that composed it. In this manner these insolent and profligate factions, as if they were playing with balls and counters, made a sport of the fortunes and the liberties of their fellow-creatures. Other acts of persecution have been acts of malice. This was a subversion of justice from wantonness and petulance. Look into the history of Bishop Burnet. He is a witness without exception.

The effects of the Act have been as mischievous as its origin was ludicrous and shameful. From that time every person of that communion, lay and ecclesiastic, has been obliged to fly from the face of day. The clergy concealed in garrets of private houses, or obliged to take shelter (hardly safe to themselves, but infinitely dangerous to their country) under the privileges of foreign ministers, officiated as their servants, and under their protection. The whole body of the Catholics, condemned to beggary and to ignorance in their native land, have been obliged to learn the principles of letters, at the hazard of all their other principles, from the charity of your enemies. They have been taxed to their ruin at the pleasure of necessitous and profligate relations, and according to the measure of their necessity and profligacy. Examples of this are many and affecting. Some of them are known to a friend who stands near me in this hall. It is but six or seven years since a clergyman of the name of Malony, a man of morals, neither guilty nor accused of anything noxious to the state was condemned to perpetual imprisonment for exercising the functions of his religion, and, after lying in jail two or three years, was relieved by the mercy of Government from perpetual imprisonment, on condition of perpetual banishment. A brother of the Earl of Shrewsbury, a Talbot, a name respectable in this country while its glory is any part of its concern, was hauled to the bar of the Old Bailey among common felons, and only escaped the same doom, either by some error in the process, or that the wretch who brought him there could not correctly describe his person; I now forget which. In short, the persecution would never have relented for a moment, if the judges, superseding (though with an ambiguous example) the strict rule of their artificial duty by the higher obligation of their conscience, did not constantly throw every difficulty in the way of such informers. But so ineffectual is the

power of legal evasion against legal iniquity, that it was but the other day that a lady of condition, beyond the middle of life, was on the point of being stripped of her whole fortune by a near relation, to whom she had been a friend and benefactor; and she must have been totally ruined, without a power of redress or mitigation from the courts of law, had not the legislature itself rushed in, and, by a special Act of Parliament, rescued her from the injustice of its own statutes. One of the Acts authorising such things was that which we in part repealed, knowing what our duty was, and doing that duty as men of honour and virtue, as good Protestants, and as good citizens! Let him stand forth that disapproves what we have done!

Gentlemen, bad laws are the worst sort of tyranny. In such a country as this, they are of all bad things the worst—worse by far than anywhere else; and they derive a particular malignity even from the wisdom and soundness of the rest of our institutions. For very obvious reasons, you cannot trust the Crown with a dispensing power over any of your laws. However, a government, be it as bad as it may, will, in the exercise of a discretionary power, discriminate times and persons; and will not ordinarily pursue any man, when its own safety is not concerned. A mercenary informer knows no distinction. Under such a system, the obnoxious people are slaves, not only to the Government, but they live at the mercy of every individual. They are at once the slaves of the whole community, and of every part of it; and the worst and most unmerciful men are those on whose goodness they most depend.

In this situation men not only shrink from the frowns of a stern magistrate, but they are obliged to fly from their very species. The seeds of destruction are sown in civil intercourse, in social habitudes. The blood of wholesome kindred is infected. Their tables and beds are surrounded with snares. All the means given by Providence to make life safe and comfortable are perverted into instruments of terror and torment. This species of universal subserviency, that makes the very servant who waits behind your chair the arbiter of your life and fortune, has such a tendency to degrade and abase mankind, and to deprive them of that assured and liberal state of mind, which alone can make us what we ought to be, that I vow to God I would sooner bring myself to put a man to immediate death for opinions I disliked, and so to get rid of the man and his opinions at once, than to fret him with a feverish being, tainted with the jail distemper of a contagious servitude, to keep him above ground, an animated mass of putrefaction; corrupted himself, and corrupting all about him.

2. The Act repealed was of this direct tendency, and it was made in the manner which I have related to you. I will now tell you by whom the bill of repeal was brought into Parliament. I find it has been industriously given out in this city (from kindness to me, unquestionably) that I was the mover or the seconder. The fact is, I did not once open my lips on the subject during the whole progress of the bill. I do not say this as disclaiming my share in that measure. Very far from it. I inform you of this fact, lest I should seem to arrogate to myself the merits which belong to others. To have been the man chosen out to redeem our fellow-citizens from slavery, to purify our laws from absurdity and injustice, and to cleanse our religion from the blot and stain of persecution, would be an honour and happiness to which my wishes would undoubtedly aspire, but to which nothing but my wishes could possibly have entitled me. That great work was in hands in every respect far better qualified than mine. The mover of the bill was Sir GEORGE SAVILE.

When an act of great and signal humanity was to be done, and done with all the weight and authority that belonged to it, the world could cast its eyes upon none but him. I hope that few things which have a tendency to bless or adorn life have wholly escaped my observation in my passage through it. I have sought the acquaintance of that gentleman, and have seen him in all situations. He is a true genius, with an understanding vigorous, and acute, and refined, and distinguishing even to excess; and illuminated with a most unbounded, peculiar, and original cast of imagination. With these he possesses many external and instrumental advantages, and he makes use of them all. His fortune is among the largest—a fortune which, wholly unencumbered, as it is, with one single charge from luxury, vanity, or excess, sinks under the benevolence of its dispenser. This private benevolence, expanding itself into patriotism, renders his whole being the estate of the public, in which he has not reserved a *peculium* for himself of profit, diversion, or relaxation.* During the session, the first in, and the last out of the House of Commons; he passes from the senate to the camp; and, seldom seeing the seat of his ancestors, he is always in Parliament to serve his country, or in the field to defend it. But in all well-wrought compositions, some particulars stand out more eminently than the rest; and the things which will carry his name to posterity are his two bills—I mean that for a limitation of the claims of the Crown upon landed estates,† and this for the relief of

* "The *peculium* among the Romans was that small amount of property which a slave was allowed to possess and call his own, as distinct from his master's estate."—*Goodrich.*

† "This bill, passed in 1769, was called the Nullum Tempus Act, because it set aside the old maxim, 'Nullum tempus regi occurrit' ('No length of possession bars the king'). It provided that the Crown should have no claim upon any estate which had been

the Roman Catholics. By the former, he has emancipated property; by the latter, he has quieted conscience; and by both, he has taught that grand lesson to Government and subject—no longer to regard each other as adverse parties.

Such was the mover of the Act that is complained of by men who are not quite so good as he is; an Act, most assuredly, not brought in by him from any partiality to that sect which is the object of it; for, among his faults, I really cannot help reckoning a greater degree of prejudice against that people than becomes so wise a man. I know that he inclines to a sort of disgust, mixed with a considerable degree of asperity, to the system; and he has few, or rather no habits [in common] with any of its professors. What he has done was on quite other motives. The motives were these, which he declared in his excellent speech on his motion for the bill; namely, his extreme zeal to the Protestant religion, which he thought utterly disgraced by the Act of 1699; and his rooted hatred to all kind of oppression, under any colour or upon any pretence whatsoever.

The seconder was worthy of the mover and the motion. I was not the secconder. It was Mr Dunning, recorder of this city. I shall say the less of him, because his near relation to you makes you more particularly acquainted with his merits. But I should appear little acquainted with them, or little sensible of them, if I could utter his name on this occasion without expressing my esteem for his character. I am not afraid of offending a most learned body, and most jealous of its reputation for that learning, when I say he is the first of his profession. It is a point settled by those who settle everything else; and I must add (what I am enabled to say from my own long and close observation) that there is not a man, of any profession, or in any situation, of a more erect and independent spirit, of a more proud honour, a more manly mind, a more firm and determined integrity. Assure yourselves that the names of two such men will bear a great load of prejudice in the other scale, before they can be entirly outweighed.

With this mover and this seconder agreed the *whole* House of Commons, the *whole* House of Lords, the *whole* bench of bishops, the king, the ministry, the Opposition, all the distinguished clergy of the establishment, all the eminent lights (for they were consulted) of the dissenting churches. This according voice of national wisdom ought to be listened to with reverence. To say that all these descriptions of Englishmen unanimously concurred in a scheme for introducing the Catholic religion, or that none of them understood the nature and effects of what they were doing, so well as a few obscure clubs of people whose names you never heard of, is shamelessly absurd. Surely it is paying a miserable compliment to the religion we profess, to suggest that everything eminent in the kingdom is indifferent, or even adverse to that religion, and that its security is wholly abandoned to the zeal of those who have nothing but their zeal to distinguish them. In weighing this unanimous concurrence of whatever the nation has to boast of, I hope you will recollect that all these concurring parties do by no means love one another enough to agree in any point which was not both evidently and importantly right.

3. To prove this—to prove that the measure was both clearly and materially proper—I will next lay before you (as I promised) the *political* grounds and reasons for the repeal of that penal statute, and the motives to its repeal at that particular time.

(1.) Gentlemen, America—when the English nation seemed to be dangerously, if not irrecoverably divided; when one, and that the most growing branch, was torn from the parent stock, and ingrafted on the power of France, a great terror fell upon this kingdom. On a sudden we awakened from our dreams of conquest, and saw ourselves threatened with an immediate invasion; which we were, at that time, very ill prepared to resist. You remember the cloud that gloomed over us all. In that hour of our dismay, from the bottom of the hiding-places into which the indiscriminate rigour of our statutes had driven them, came out the Roman Catholics. They appeared before the steps of a tottering throne with one of the most sober, measured, steady, and dutiful addresses that was ever presented to the Crown. It was no holiday ceremony; no anniversary compliment of parade or show. It was signed by almost every gentleman of that persuasion of note or property in England. At such a crisis, nothing but a decided resolution to stand or fall with their country could have dictated such an address; the direct tendency of which was to cut off all retreat, and to render them peculiarly obnoxious to an invader of their own communion. The address showed, what I long languished to see, that all the subjects of England had cast off all foreign views and connections, and that every man looked for his relief from every grievance at the hands only of his own natural Government.

It was necessary, on our part, that the natural Government should show itself worthy of that name. It was necessary, at the crisis I speak of, that the supreme power of the state should meet the conciliatory dispositions of the subject. To delay protection would be to reject allegiance. And why should it be rejected, or even coldly and suspiciously received? If any independent Catholic state should choose to take part with this kingdom in a war with France and Spain, that bigot (if such a bigot could be found) would be heard with little respect who could dream of

---

enjoyed by any one during sixty years of undisputed possession."—*Goodrich.*

objecting his religion to an ally, whom the nation would not only receive with its freest thanks, but purchase with the last remains of its exhausted treasure. To such an ally we should not dare to whisper a single syllable of those base and invidious topics, upon which some unhappy men would persuade the state to reject the duty and allegiance of its own members. Is it, then, because foreigners are in a condition to set our malice at defiance, that with *them* we are willing to contract engagements of friendship, and to keep them with fidelity and honour; but that, because we conceive some descriptions of our countrymen are not powerful enough to punish our malignity, we will not permit them to support our common interest? Is it on that ground that our anger is to be kindled by their offered kindness? Is it on that ground that they are to be subjected to penalties, because they are willing by actual merit to purge themselves from imputed crimes? Lest by an adherance to the cause of their country they should acquire a title to fair and equitable treatment, are we resolved to furnish them with causes of eternal enmity, and rather supply them with just and founded motives to disaffection, than not to have that disaffection in existence to justify an oppression, which, not from policy but disposition, we have predetermined to exercise?

What shadow of reason could be assigned, why, at a time when the most Protestant part of this Protestant empire [America] found it for its advantage to unite with the two principal popish states, to unite itself in the closest bonds with France and Spain for our destruction, that we should refuse to unite with our own Catholic countrymen for our own preservation? Ought we, like madmen, to tear off the plasters that the lenient hand of prudence had spread over the wounds and gashes, which, in our delirium of ambition, we had given to our own body? No person ever reprobated the American war more than I did, and do, and ever shall. But I never will consent that we should lay additional voluntary penalties on ourselves for a fault which carries but too much of its own punishment in its own nature. For one, I was delighted with the proposal of internal peace. I accepted the blessing with thankfulness and transport; I was truly happy to find *one* good effect of our civil distractions, that they had put an end to all religious strife and heart-burning in our own bowels. What must be the sentiments of a man who would wish to perpetuate domestic hostility, when the causes of dispute are at an end; and who, crying out for peace with one part of the nation on the most humiliating terms, should deny it to those who offer friendship without any terms at all?

(2.) But if I was unable to reconcile such a denial to the contracted principles of local duty, what answer could I give to the broad claims of general humanity? I confess to you freely, that the sufferings and distresses of the people of America in this cruel war have at times affected me more deeply than I can express. I felt every gazette of triumph as a blow upon my heart, which has a hundred times sunk and fainted within me at all the mischiefs brought upon those who bear the whole brunt of war in the heart of their country. Yet the Americans are utter strangers to me; a nation among whom I am not sure that I have a single acquaintance. Was I to suffer my mind to be so unaccountably warped; was I to keep such iniquitous weights and measures of temper and of reason, as to sympathise with those who are in open rebellion against an authority which I respect, at war with a country which by every title ought to be, and is most dear to me; and yet to have no feeling at all for the hardships and indignities suffered by men, who, by their very vicinity, are bound up in a nearer relation to us; who contribute their share, and more than their share, to the common prosperity; who perform the common offices of social life, and who obey the laws to the full as well as I do? Gentlemen, the danger to the state being out of the question (of which, let me tell you, statesmen themselves are apt to have but too exquisite a sense), I could assign no one reason of justice, policy, or feeling, for not concurring most cordially, as most cordially I did concur, in softening some part of that shameful servitude, under which several of my worthy fellow-citizens were groaning.

(3.) Important effects followed this act of wisdom. They appeared at home and abroad to the great benefit of this kingdom; and, let me hope, to the advantage of mankind at large. It betokened union among ourselves. It showed soundness even on the part of the persecuted, which generally is the weak side of every community. But its most essential operation was not in England. The Act was immediately, though very imperfectly, copied in Ireland; and this imperfect transcript of an imperfect Act, this first faint sketch of toleration, which did little more than disclose a principle, and mark out a disposition, completed in a most wonderful manner the re-union to the state of all the Catholics of that country. It made us, what we ought always to have been, one family, one body, one heart and soul, against the family combination, and all other combinations of our enemies. We have indeed obligations to that people, who received such small benefits with so much gratitude; and for which gratitude and attachment to us, I am afraid, they have suffered not a little in other places.

I daresay you have all heard of the privileges indulged to the Irish Catholics residing in Spain. You have likewise heard with what circumstances of severity they have been lately expelled from the seaports of that kingdom, driven into the inland cities, and there detained

as a sort of prisoners of state. I have good reason to believe that it was the zeal to our government and our cause (somewhat indiscreetly expressed in one of the addresses of the Catholics of Ireland) which has thus drawn down on their heads the indignation of the court of Madrid, to the inexpressible loss of several individuals, and, in future, perhaps, to the great detriment of the whole of their body. Now, that our people should be persecuted in Spain for their attachment to this country, and persecuted in this country for their supposed enmity to us, is such a jarring reconciliation of contradictory distresses, is a thing at once so dreadful and ridiculous, that no malice short of diabolical would wish to continue any human creatures in such a situation. But honest men will not forget either their merit or their sufferings. There are men (and many, I trust, there are) who, out of love to their country and their kind, would torture their invention to find excuses for the mistakes of their brethren, and who, to stifle dissension, would construe even doubtful appearances with the utmost favour. Such men will never persuade themselves to be ingenious and refined in discovering disaffection and treason in the manifest, palpable signs of suffering loyalty. Persecution is so unnatural to them, that they gladly snatch the very first opportunity of laying aside all the tricks and devices of penal politics, and of returning home, after all their irksome and vexatious wanderings, to our natural family mansion, to the grand social principle that unites all men, in all descriptions, under the shadow of an equal and impartial justice.

Men of another sort—I mean the bigoted enemies to liberty—may perhaps, in their politics, make no account of the good or ill affection of the Catholics of England, who are but a handful of people (enough to torment, but not enough to fear), perhaps not so many, of both sexes and of all ages, as fifty thousand. But, gentlemen, it is possible you may not know that the people of that persuasion in Ireland amount at least to sixteen or seventeen hundred thousand souls. I do not at all exaggerate the number. A *nation* to be persecuted! While we were masters of the sea, embodied with America, and in alliance with half the powers of the Continent, we might perhaps, in that remote corner of Europe, afford to tyrannise with impunity. But there is a revolution in our affairs which makes it prudent to be just. In our late awkward contest with Ireland about trade, had religion been thrown in, to ferment and imbitter the mass of discontents, the consequences might have been truly dreadful; but, very happily, that cause of quarrel was previously quieted by the wisdom of the Acts I am commending.

Even in England, where I admit the danger from the discontent of that persuasion to be less than in Ireland; yet, even here, had we listened to the counsels of fanaticism and folly, we might have wounded ourselves very deeply, and wounded ourselves in a very tender part. You are apprised that the Catholics of England consist mostly of your best manufacturers. Had the legislature chosen, instead of returning their declarations of duty with correspondent good will, to drive them to despair, there is a country at their very door to which they would be invited; a country in all respects as good as ours, and with the finest cities in the world ready built to receive them; and thus the bigotry of a free country, and in an enlightened age, would have repeopled the cities of Flanders, which, in the darkness of two hundred years ago, had been desolated by the superstition of a cruel tyrant. Our manufactures were the growth of the persecutions of the Low Countries. What a spectacle would it be to Europe to see us, at this time of day, balancing the account of tyranny with those very countries, and, by our persecutions, driving back trade and manufacture, as a sort of vagabonds, to their original settlement! But I trust we shall be saved this last of disgraces.

(4.) So far as to the effect of the Act on the interests of this nation. With regard to the interests of mankind at large, I am sure the benefit was very considerable. Long before this Act, indeed, the spirit of toleration began to gain ground in Europe. In Holland the third part of the people are Catholics; they live at ease, and are a sound part of the state. In many parts of Germany, Protestants and Papists partake the same cities, the same councils, and even the same churches. The unbounded liberality of the King of Prussia's conduct on this occasion is known to all the world, and it is of a piece with the other grand maxims of his reign. The magnanimity of the imperial court, breaking through the narrow principles of its predecessors, has indulged its Protestant subjects not only with property, with worship, with liberal education, but with honours and trusts, both civil and military. A worthy Protestant gentleman of this country now fills, and fills with credit, a high office in the Austrian Netherlands. Even the Lutheran obstinacy of Sweden has thawed at length, and opened a toleration to all religions. I know, myself, that in France the Protestants begin to be at rest. The army, which in that country is everything, is open to them; and some of the military rewards and decorations which the laws deny, are supplied by others, to make the service acceptable and honourable. The first minister of finance in that country [Necker] is a Protestant. Two years' war without a tax is among the first fruits of their liberality. Tarnished as the glory of this nation is, and as far as it has waded into the shades of an eclipse, some beams of its former illumination still play upon its surface, and what is done in England is still looked to as argument, and as

example. It is certainly true, that no law of this country ever met with such universal applause abroad, or was so likely to produce the perfection of that tolerating spirit, which, as I observed, has been long gaining ground in Europe; for abroad it was universally thought that we had done what, I am sorry to say, we had not; they thought we had granted a full toleration. That opinion was, however, so far from hurting the Protestant cause, that I declare, with the most serious solemnity, my firm belief, that no one thing done for these fifty years past was so likely to prove deeply beneficial to our religion at large as Sir George Savile's Act. In its effects it was "An Act for tolerating and protecting Protestantism throughout Europe;" and I hope that those who were taking steps for the quiet and settlement of our Protestant brethren in other countries will, even yet, rather consider the steady equity of the greater and better part of the people of Great Britain, than the vanity and violence of a few.

I perceive, gentlemen, by the manner of all about me, that you look with horror on the wicked clamour which has been raised on this subject, and that, instead of an apology for what was done, you rather demand from me an account why the execution of the scheme of toleration was not made more answerable to the large and liberal grounds on which it was taken up. The question is natural and proper; and I remember that a great and learned magistrate [Lord Thurlow], distinguished for his strong and systematic understanding, and who at that time was a member of the House of Commons, made the same objection to the proceeding. The statutes, as they now stand, are, without doubt, perfectly absurd; but I beg leave to explain the cause of this gross imperfection in the tolerating plan as well and as shortly as I am able. It was universally thought that the session ought not to pass over without doing *something* in this business. To revise the whole body of the penal statutes was conceived to be an object too big for the time. The penal statute, therefore, which was chosen for repeal (chosen to show our disposition to conciliate, not to perfect a toleration), was this Act of ludicrous cruelty, of which I have just given you the history. It is an Act which, though not by a great deal so fierce and bloody as some of the rest, was infinitely more ready in the execution. It was the Act which gave the greatest encouragement to those pests of society, mercenary informers, and interested disturbers of household peace; and it was observed, with truth, that the prosecutions, either carried to conviction or compounded, for many years, had been all commenced upon that Act. It was said, that while we were deliberating on the more perfect scheme, the spirit of the age would never come up to the execution of the statutes which remained, especially as more steps, and a co-operation of more minds and powers, were required toward a mischievous use of them, than for the execution of the Act to be repealed; that it was better to unravel this texture from below than from above, beginning with the latest, which, in general practice, is the severest evil. It was alleged that this slow proceeding would be attended with the advantage of a progressive experience, and that the people would grow reconciled to toleration, when they should find, by the effects, that justice was not so irreconcilable an enemy to convenience as they had imagined.

These, gentlemen, were the reasons why we left this good work in the rude, unfinished state in which good works are commonly left, through the tame circumspection with which a timid prudence so frequently enervates beneficence. In doing good, we are generally cold, and languid, and sluggish, and, of all things, afraid of being too much in the right. But the works of malice and injustice are quite in another style. They are finished with a bold, masterly hand; touched, as they are, with the spirit of those vehement passions that call forth all our energies whenever we oppress and persecute.

Thus this matter was left for the time, with the full determination in Parliament not to suffer other and worse statutes to remain, for the purpose of counteracting the benefits proposed by the repeal of one penal law; for nobody then dreamed of defending what was done as a benefit, on the ground of its being no benefit at all. We were not then ripe for so mean a subterfuge.

I do not wish to go over the horrid scene that was afterward acted. Would to God it could be expunged for ever from the annals of this country! but, since it must subsist for our shame, let it subsist for our instruction. In the year 1780 there were found in this nation men deluded enough (for I give the whole to their delusion), on pretences of zeal and piety, without any sort of provocation whatsoever, real or pretended, to make a desperate attempt, which would have consumed all the glory and power of this country in the flames of London, and buried all law, order, and religion, under the ruins of the metropolis of the Protestant world. Whether all this mischief done, or in the direct train of doing, was in their original scheme, I cannot say. I hope it was not; but this would have been the unavoidable consequence of their proceedings, had not the flames they lighted up in their fury been extinguished in their blood.

All the time that this horrid scene was acting or avenging, as well as for some time before, and ever since, the wicked instigators of this unhappy multitude, guilty, with every aggravation, of all their crimes, and screened in a cowardly darkness from their punishment, continued, without interruption, pity, or remorse, to blow up the blind rage of the populace with a continued

blast of pestilential libels, which infected and poisoned the very air we breathed in.

The main drift of all the libels and all the riots was to force Parliament (to persuade us was hopeless) into an act of national perfidy which has no example; for, gentlemen, it is proper you should all know what infamy we escaped by refusing that repeal, for a refusal of which, it seems, I, among others, stand somewhere or other accused. When we took away, on the motives which I had the honour of stating to you, a few of the innumerable penalties upon an oppressed and injured people, the relief was not absolute, but given on a stipulation and compact between them and us; for we bound down the Roman Catholics with the most solemn oaths to bear true allegiance to this Government; to abjure all sort of temporal power in any other; and to renounce, under the same solemn obligations, the doctrines of systematic perfidy with which they stood (I conceive very unjustly) charged. Now our modest petitioners came up to us, most humbly praying nothing more than that we should break our faith, without any one cause whatsoever of forfeiture assigned; and when the subjects of this kingdom had on their part fully performed their engagement, we should refuse on our part the benefit we had stipulated on the performance of those very conditions that were prescribed by our own authority, and taken on the sanction of our public faith, that is to say, when we had inveigled them with fair promises within our door, we were to shut it on them, and, adding mockery to outrage, to tell them, "Now we have got you fast; your consciences are bound to a power resolved on your destruction. We have made you swear that your religion obliges you to keep your faith. Fools, as you are! we will now let you see that our religion enjoins us to keep no faith with you." They who would advisedly call upon us to do such things must certainly have thought us not only a convention of treacherous tyrants, but a gang of the lowest and dirtiest wretches that ever disgraced humanity. Had we done this, we should have indeed proved that there were *some* in the world whom no faith could bind; and we should have *convicted* ourselves of that odious principle of which Papists stood *accused* by those very savages, who wished us, on that accusation, to deliver them over to their fury.

In this audacious tumult, when our very name and character, as gentlemen, was to be cancelled for ever, along with the faith and honour of the nation, I, who had exerted myself very little on the quiet passing of the bill, thought it necessary then to come forward. I was not alone; but though some distinguished members on all sides, and particularly on ours, added much to their high reputation by the part they took on that day (a part which will be remembered as long as honour, spirit, and eloquence have estimation in the world), I may and will value myself so far, that, yielding in abilities to many, I yielded in zeal to none. With warmth and with vigour, and animated with a just and natural indignation, I called forth every faculty that I possessed, and I directed it in every way which I could possibly employ it. I laboured night and day. I laboured in Parliament. I laboured out of Parliament. If, therefore, the resolution of the House of Commons, refusing to commit this act of unmatched turpitude, be a crime, I am guilty among the foremost; but indeed, whatever the faults of that House may have been, no one member was found hardy enough to propose so infamous a thing; and, on full debate, we passed the resolution against the petitions with as much unanimity as we had formerly passed the law of which these petitions demanded the repeal.

There was a circumstance (justice will not suffer me to pass it over) which, if anything could enforce the reasons I have given, would fully justify the Act of relief, and render a repeal, or anything like a repeal, unnatural, impossible. It was the behaviour of the persecuted Roman Catholics under the acts of violence and brutal insolence which they suffered. I suppose there are not in London less than four or five thousand of that persuasion from my country, who do a great deal of the most labourious works in the metropolis, and they chiefly inhabit those quarters which were the principal theatre of the fury of the bigoted multitude. They are known to be men of strong arms and quick feelings, and more remarkable for a determined resolution than clear ideas or much foresight; but though provoked by everything that can stir the blood of men, their houses and chapels in flames, and with the most atrocious profanations of everything which they hold sacred before their eyes, not a hand was moved to retaliate or even to defend. Had a conflict once begun, the rage of their persecutors would have redoubled. Thus, fury increasing by the reverberation of outrages, house being fired for house, and church for chapel, I am convinced that no power under heaven could have prevented a general conflagration, and at this day London would have been a tale; but I am well informed, and the thing speaks it, that their clergy exerted their whole influence to keep their people in such a state of forbearance and quiet, as, when I look back, fills me with astonishment; but not with astonishment only. Their merits on that occasion ought not to be forgotten; nor will they, when Englishmen come to recollect themselves. I am sure it were far more proper to have called them forth and given them the thanks of both Houses of Parliament, than to have suffered those worthy clergymen and excellent citizens to be hunted into holes and corners, while we are making low-minded inquisitions into the number of their people; as if a tolerating principle was never to

prevail, unless we were very sure that only a few could possibly take advantage of it. But indeed we are not yet well recovered of our fright. Our reason, I trust, will return with our security, and this unfortunate temper will pass over like a cloud.

Gentlemen, I have now laid before you a few of the reasons for taking away the penalties of the Act of 1699, and for refusing to establish them on the riotous requisition of 1780. Because I would not suffer anything which may be for your satisfaction to escape, permit me just to touch on the objections urged against our Act and our resolves, and intended as a justification of the violence offered to both Houses. "Parliament," they assert, "was too hasty, and they ought, in so essential and alarming a change, to have proceeded with a far greater degree of deliberation." The direct contrary. Parliament was too slow. They took fourscore years to deliberate on the repeal of an Act which ought not to have survived a second session. When at length, after a procrastination of near a century, the business was taken up, it proceeded in the most public manner, by the ordinary stages, and as slowly as a law, so evidently right as to be resisted by none, would naturally advance. Had it been read three times in one day, we should have shown only a becoming readiness to recognise by protection the undoubted dutiful behaviour of those whom we had but too long punished for offences of presumption or conjecture. But for what end was that bill to linger beyond the usual period of an unopposed measure? Was it to be delayed until a rabble in Edinburgh should dictate to the Church of England what measure of persecution was fitting for her safety?* Was it to be adjourned until a fanatical force could be collected in London, sufficient to frighten us out of all our ideas of policy and justice? Were we to wait for the profound lectures on the reason of state, ecclesiastical and political, which the Protestant Association have since condescended to read to us? Or were we, seven hundred peers and commoners, the only persons ignorant of the ribald invectives which occupy the place of argument in those remonstrances, which every man of common observation had heard a thousand times over, and a thousand times over had despised? All men had before heard what they have to say; and all men at this day know what they dare to do; and I trust, all honest men are equally influenced by the one and by the other.

But they tell us, that those our fellow-citizens, whose chains we have a little relaxed, are enemies to liberty and our free constitution—not enemies, I presume, to their *own* liberty; and as to the constitution, until we give them some share in it, I do not know on what pretence we can examine into their opinions about a business in which they have no interest or concern. But after all, are we equally sure that they are adverse to our constitution, as that our statutes are hostile and destructive to them? For my part, I have reason to believe their opinions and inclinations in that respect are various, exactly like those of other men; and if they lean more to the Crown than I, and than many of you think *we* ought, we must remember that he who aims at another's life is not to be surprised if he flies into any sanctuary that will receive him. The tenderness of the executive power is the natural asylum of those upon whom the laws have declared war; and to complain that men are inclined to favour the means of their own safety, is so absurd that one forgets the injustice in the ridicule.

I must fairly tell you that, so far as my principles are concerned (principles that I hope will only depart with my last breath), I have no idea of a liberty unconnected with honesty and justice. Nor do I believe that any good constitutions of government or of freedom can find it necessary for their security to doom any part of the people to a permanent slavery. Such a constitution of freedom, if such can be, is in effect no more than another name for the tyranny of the strongest faction; and factions in republics have been, and are, full as capable as monarchs, of the most cruel oppression and injustice. It is but too true that the love, and even the very idea, of genuine liberty is extremely rare. It is but too true that there are many whose whole scheme of freedom is made up of pride, perverseness, and insolence. They feel themselves in a state of thraldom; they imagine that their souls are cooped and cabined in, unless they have some man, or some body of men, dependent on their mercy. This desire of having some one below them descends to those who are the very lowest of all—and a Protestant cobbler, debased by his poverty, but exalted by his share of the ruling Church, feels a pride in knowing it is by his generosity alone that the peer, whose footman's instep he measures, is able to keep his chaplain from a jail. This disposition is the true source of the passion which many men in very humble life have taken to the American war. *Our* subjects in America! *our* colonies! *our* dependants! This lust of party power is the liberty they hunger and thirst for, and this siren song of ambition has charmed ears that one would have thought were never organised to that sort of music.

This way of *proscribing the citizens by denominations and general descriptions*, dignified by the name of reason of state, and security for constitutions and commonwealths, is nothing better at bottom than the miserable invention of an ungenerous ambition, which would fain hold the sacred trust of power without any of the virtues, or any of the energies, that give a

* The Protestant Association originated at Edinburgh.

title to it; a receipt of policy made up of a detestable compound of malice, cowardice, and sloth. They would govern men against their will; but in that government they would be discharged from the exercise of vigilance, providence, and fortitude; and therefore, that they may sleep on their watch, they consent to take some one division of the society into partnership of the tyranny over the rest. But let government, in what form it may be, comprehend the whole in its justice, and restrain the suspicious by its vigilance; let it keep watch and ward, let it discover by its sagacity, and punish by its firmness, all delinquency against its power, whenever delinquency exists in the overt acts; and then it will be as safe as ever God and nature intended it should be. Crimes are the acts of individuals, and not of denominations; and therefore arbitrarily to class men under general descriptions, in order to proscribe and punish them in the lump for a presumed delinquency, of which perhaps but a part, perhaps none at all, are guilty, is indeed a compendious method, and saves a world of trouble about proof; but such a method, instead of being law, is an act of unnatural rebellion against the legal dominion of reason and justice; and this vice, in any constitution that entertains it, at one time or other will certainly bring on its ruin.

We are told that this is not a religious persecution, and its abettors are loud in disclaiming all severities on account of conscience. Very fine, indeed! Then let it be so. They are not persecutors, they are only tyrants. With all my heart. I am perfectly indifferent concerning the pretexts upon which we torment one another; or whether it be for the constitution of the Church of England, or for the constitution of the state of England, that people choose to make their fellow-creatures wretched. When we were sent into a place of authority, you that sent us had yourselves but one commission to give. You could give us none to wrong or oppress, or even to suffer any kind of oppression or wrong, on any grounds whatsoever; not on political, as in the affairs of America; not on commercial, as in those of Ireland; not in civil, as in the laws for debt; not in religious, as in the statutes against Protestant or Catholic dissenters. The diversified but connected fabric of universal justice is well cramped and bolted together in all its parts; and, depend upon it, I never have employed, and I never shall employ, any engine of power which may come into my hands to wrench it asunder. All shall stand if I can help it, and all shall stand connected. After all, to complete this work, much remains to be done; much in the east, much in the west. But great as the work is, if our will be ready, our powers are not deficient.

Since you have suffered me to trouble you so much on this subject, permit me, gentlemen, to detain you a little longer. I am, indeed, most solicitous to give you perfect satisfaction. I find there are some of a better and softer nature than the persons with whom I have supposed myself in debate, who neither think ill of the Act of relief, nor by any means desire the repeal; not accusing, but lamenting what was done, on account of the consequences, have frequently expressed their wish that the late Act had never been made. Some of this description, and persons of worth, I have met with in this city. They conceive that the prejudices, whatever they might be, of a large part of the people, ought not to have been shocked; that their opinions ought to have been previously taken, and much attended to; and that thereby the late horrid scenes might have been prevented.

I confess my notions are widely different; and I never was less sorry for any action of my life. I like the bill the better on account of the events of all kinds that followed it. It relieved the real sufferers; it strengthened the state; and by the disorders that ensued, we had clear evidence that there lurked a temper somewhere, which ought not to be fostered by the laws. No ill consequences whatever could be attributed to the Act itself. We knew beforehand, or we were poorly instructed, that toleration is odious to the intolerant, freedom to oppressors, property to robbers, and all kinds and degrees of prosperity to the envious. We knew that all these kinds of men would gladly gratify their evil dispositions under the sanction of law and religion, if they could; if they could not, yet, to make way to their objects, they would do their utmost to subvert all religion and all law. This we certainly knew: but knowing this, is there any reason because thieves break in and steal, and thus bring detriment to you and draw ruin on themselves, that I am to be sorry that you are in possession of shops, and of warehouses, and of wholesome laws to protect them? Are you to build no houses because desperate men may pull them down upon their own heads? Or, if a malignant wretch will cut his own throat because he sees you give alms to the necessitous and deserving, shall his destruction be attributed to your charity, and not to his own deplorable madness? If we repent of our good actions, what, I pray you, is left for our faults and follies? It is not the beneficence of the laws, it is the unnatural temper which beneficence can fret and sour, that is to be lamented. It is this temper which, by all rational means, ought to be sweetened and corrected. If froward men should refuse this cure, can they vitiate anything but themselves? Does evil so react upon good, as not only to retard its motion, but to change its nature? If it can so operate, then good men will always be in the power of the bad; and virtue, by a dreadful reverse of order, must lie under perpetual subjection and bondage to vice.

As to the opinion of the people, which some think, in such cases, is to be implicitly obeyed, near two years' tranquillity, which followed the Act, and its instant imitation in Ireland, proved abundantly that the late horrible spirit was, in a great measure, the effect of insidious art, and perverse industry, and gross misrepresentation. But suppose that the dislike had been much more deliberate, and much more general than I am persuaded it was. When we know that the opinions of even the greatest multitudes are the standard of rectitude, I shall think myself obliged to make those opinions the masters of my conscience. But if it may be doubted whether omnipotence itself is competent to alter the essential constitution of right and wrong, sure I am that such *things* as they and I are possessed of no such power. No man carries further than I do the policy of making government pleasing to the people; but the widest range of this politic complacence is confined within the limits of justice. I would not only consult the interests of the people, but I would cheerfully gratify their humours. We are all a sort of children that must be soothed and managed. I think I am not austere or formal in my nature. I would bear—I would even myself play my part in any innocent buffooneries to divert them; but I never will act the tyrant for their amusement. If they will mix malice in their sports, I shall never consent to throw them any living, sentient creature whatsoever, no, not so much as a kitling, to torment.

"But if I profess all this impolitic stubbornness, I may chance never to be elected into Parliament." It is certainly not pleasing to be put out of the public service. But I wish to be a Member of Parliament, to have my share of doing good and resisting evil. It would therefore be absurd to renounce my objects in order to obtain my seat. I deceive myself, indeed, most grossly, if I had not much rather pass the remainder of my life hidden in the recesses of the deepest obscurity, feeding my mind even with the visions and imaginations of such things, than to be placed on the most splendid throne of the universe, tantalised with the denial of the practice of all which can make the greatest situation any other than the greatest curse. Gentlemen, I have had my day. I can never sufficiently express my gratitude to you for having set me in a place wherein I could lend the slightest help to great and laudable designs. If I have had my share in any measure giving quiet to private property, and private conscience; if, by my vote, I have aided in securing to families the best possession, peace; if I have joined in reconciling kings to their subjects, and subjects to their prince; if I have assisted to loosen the foreign holdings of the citizen, and taught him to look for his protection to the laws of his country, and for his comfort to the goodwill of his countrymen; if I have thus taken my part with the best of men in the best of their actions, I can shut the book. I might wish to read a page or two more; but this is enough for my measure. I have not lived in vain.

And now, gentlemen, on this serious day, when I come, as it were, to make up my account with you, let me take to myself some degree of honest pride on the nature of the charges that are against me. I do not here stand before you accused of venality, or of neglect of duty. It is not said that, in the long period of my service, I have, in a single instance, sacrificed the slightest of your interests to my ambition, or to my fortune. It is not alleged that, to gratify any anger, or revenge of my own, or of my party, I have had a share in wronging or oppressing any description of men, or any one man in any description. No! The charges against me are all of one kind, that I have pushed the principles of general justice and benevolence too far; further than a cautious policy would warrant, and further than the opinions of many would go along with me. In every accident which may happen through life—in pain, in sorrow, in depression, and distress—I will call to mind this accusation, and be comforted.

Gentlemen, I submit the whole to your judgment. Mr Mayor, I thank you for the trouble you have taken on this occasion. In your state of health, it is particularly obliging. If this company should think it advisable for me to withdraw, I shall respectfully retire. If you think otherwise, I shall go directly to the council-house and to the 'change, and, without a moment's delay, begin my canvass.

[At the close of his speech, Mr Burke was encouraged to go on with the canvass; but the opposition being too decided on the second day of the election, he declined the poll in the speech which follows.]

SPEECH DECLINING ELECTION.*

GENTLEMEN,—I decline the election. It has ever been my rule through life to observe a proportion between my efforts and my objects. I have never been remarkable for a bold, active, and sanguine pursuit of advantages that are personal to myself.

I have not canvassed the whole of this city in form; but I have taken such a view of it as satisfies my own mind that your choice will not ultimately fall upon me. Your city, gentlemen, is in a state of miserable distraction; and I am resolved to withdraw whatever share my pretensions may have had in its unhappy divisions. I have not been in haste. I have tried all prudent means. I have waited for the effect of all contingencies. If I were fond of a contest, by the

* Delivered September 9, 1780.

partiality of my numerous friends (whom you know to be among the most weighty and respectable people of the city) I have the means of a sharp one in my hands; but I thought it far better, with my strength unspent, and my reputation unimpaired, to do early and from foresight that which I might be obliged to do from necessity at last.

I am not in the least surprised, nor in the least angry at this view of things. I have read the book of life for a long time, and I have read other books a little. Nothing has happened to me but what has happened to men much better than me, and in times and in nations full as good as the age and country that we live in. To say that I am no way concerned would be neither decent nor true. The representation of *Bristol* was an object on many accounts dear to me, and I certainly should very far prefer it to any other in the kingdom. My habits are made to it; and it is in general more unpleasant to be rejected after a long trial than not to be chosen at all.

But, gentlemen, I will see nothing except your former kindness, and I will give way to no other sentiments than those of gratitude. From the bottom of my heart I thank you for what you have done for me. You have given me a long term, which is now expired. I have performed the conditions, and enjoyed all the profits to the full; and I now surrender your estate into your hands without being in a single tile or a single stone impaired or wasted by my use. I have served the public for fifteen years. I have served you, in particular, for six. What is past is well stored. It is safe, and out of the power of fortune. What is to come is in wiser hands than ours, and He in whose hands it is, best knows whether it is best for you and me that I should be in Parliament, or even in the world.

Gentlemen, the melancholy event of yesterday reads to us an awful lesson against being too much troubled about any of the objects of ordinary ambition. The worthy gentleman who has been snatched from us at the moment of the election, and in the middle of the contest, while his desires were as warm and his hopes as eager as ours, has feelingly told us what shadows we are, and what shadows we pursue.*

It has been usual for a candidate who declines, to take his leave by a letter to the sheriffs; but I received your trust in the face of day, and in the face of day I accept your dismission. I am not—I am not at all ashamed to look upon you, nor can my presence discompose the order of business here. I humbly and respectfully take my leave of the sheriffs, the candidates, and the electors, wishing heartily that the choice may be for the best at a time which calls, if ever time did call, for service that is not nominal. It is no plaything you are about. I tremble when I consider the trust I have presumed to ask. I confided perhaps too much in my intentions. They were really fair and upright; and I am bold to say that I ask no ill thing for you when, on parting from this place, I pray that whomever you choose to succeed me, he may resemble me exactly in all things except in my abilities to serve and my fortune to please you.

LORD THURLOW.

1732-1806.

REPLY TO THE DUKE OF RICHMOND.

[THE Duke had taunted him in the House of Lords, June 1779, on his plebeian extraction and recent admission to the Peerage, when he replied as follows:]

I am amazed at the attack which the noble duke has made upon me. Yes, my lords (*considerably raising his voice*), I am amazed at his grace's speech. The noble duke cannot look before him, behind him, or on either side of him, without seeing some noble peer who owes his seat in this House to his successful exertions in the profession to which I belong. Does he not feel that it is as honourable to owe it to these as to be the accident of an accident? To all these noble lords, the language of the noble duke is as applicable and as insulting as to myself; but I do not fear to meet it singly and alone. No one venerates the peerage more than I do; but, my lords, I must say that peerage solicited me, not I the peerage. Nay more, I can say, and will say, that as a peer of Parliament—as Speaker of this right honourable House—as Keeper of the Great Seal—as guardian of his Majesty's conscience—as Lord High Chancellor of England—nay, even in that character alone in which the noble duke would think it an affront to be considered, but which character none can deny me—as a *man*, I am at this moment as respectable; I beg leave to add, I am at this moment as much respected as the proudest peer I now look down upon.

---

* Mr Coombe, one of his competitors, who had died suddenly the evening before.

CHARLES JAMES FOX.

1749-1806.

THE RUSSIAN ARMAMENT.*

[THE circumstances under which this speech was delivered are thus given by Dr Goodrich: "Turkey having commenced war against Russia in 1788, Joseph, Emperor of Austria, espoused the cause of the Russians, and attacked the Turks. At the end of two years, however, Joseph died, and his successor, Leopold, being unwilling to continue the contest, resolved on peace. He therefore called in the mediation of England and Prussia at the Congress of Reichenbach; and the three allied powers demanded of the Empress of Russia to unite in making peace on the principle of the *status quo*, that is, of giving up all the conquests she had gained during the war. To this Catharine strongly objected, and urged the formation of a new Christian kingdom out of the Turkish provinces of Bessarabia, Moldavia, and Wallachia, over which her grandson Constantine was expected to be ruler This the allied powers refused, on the ground of its giving too great a preponderance to Russia; and the empress, being unable to resist so strong an alliance, consented finally to relinquish all her conquests, with the exception of the fortress of Oczakow (pronounced *Otchakoff*), at the mouth of the Dnieper, on the Black Sea, and a desert tract of country dependent thereon, which was valuable only as a security for her former conquests. England and Prussia, however, insisted on her restoring Oczakow, to which they attached undue importance as the supposed key of Constantinople, distant about 190 miles. The pride of Catharine was touched, and she indignantly refused. Mr Pitt instantly prepared for war, and with his views and feelings at that time he would probably have thrown himself into the contest with all the energy and determination which marked his character. He continued his preparations for war (fearing, no doubt, that the empress might rise in her demands), and thus brought upon himself new charges of wasting the public money, since it turned out that Catharine was still ready to abide by her original terms. On those terms the matter was finally adjusted, Mr Pitt pledging himself that Turkey should accept them within four months, or be abandoned to her fate. Accordingly, peace was concluded on this basis between the empress and the Porte in August 1791, and Oczakow has remained from that time in the hands of the Russians."

* A speech delivered in the House of Commons, March 1, 1792.

"Fox's eloquence," says Lord Brougham, "was of a kind which, to comprehend, you must have heard himself. When he got fairly into his subject, was heartily warmed with it, he poured forth words and periods of fire that smote you, and deprived you of all power to reflect and rescue yourself, while he went on to seize the faculties of the listener, and carry them captive along with him whithersoever he might please to rush."]

SIR,—After the challenge which was thrown out to me, in the speech of a right honourable gentleman [Mr Dundas] last night, I consider it my duty to trouble you somewhat at length on this important question. But before I enter into the consideration of it, I will explain why I did not obey a call made, and repeated several times, in a manner not very consistent either with the freedom of debate or with the order which the right honourable gentleman [Mr Pitt] himself has prescribed for the discussion of this day. Why any members should think themselves entitled to call on an individual in that way, I know not; but why I did not yield to the call is obvious. It was said by an honourable gentleman last night to be the wish of the minister to hear all that could be said on the subject before he should rise to enter into his defence. If so, it certainly would not become me to prevent him from hearing any other gentleman who might be inclined to speak on the occasion; and as he particularly alluded to me, I thought it respectful to give way to gentlemen, that I might not interrupt the course which he has chosen, as it seems he reserves himself till I have spoken.

This call on me is of a singular nature. A minister is accused of having rashly engaged the country in a measure by which we have suffered disaster and disgrace, and when a motion of censure is made, he chooses to reserve himself, and speak after every one, that no means may be given to reply to his defence—to expose his fallacy, if fallacious, or to detect its misrepresentations, if he shall choose to misrepresent what may be said. If the right honourable gentleman is truly desirous of meeting the charges against him, and has confidence in his ability to vindicate his conduct, why not pursue the course which would be manly and open? Why not go into a committee, as was offered him by the honourable gentleman who made the motion [Mr Whitbread], in which the forms of this House would have permitted members on each side to answer whatever was advanced by

the other, and the subject would have received the most ample discussion? Instead of this honourable course, he is determined to take all advantages. He screens himself by a stratagem which no defendant in any process in this country could enjoy; since no man put upon his defence in any court of justice could so contrive as not only to prevent all reply to his defence, but all refutation of what he may assert, and all explanation of what he may misrepresent.

Such are the advantages which the right honourable gentleman [Mr Pitt] is determined to seize in this moment of his trial; and, to confess the truth, never did man stand so much in need of every advantage! Never was there an occasion in which a minister was exhibited to this House in circumstances so ungracious as those under which he at present appears. Last session of Parliament we had no fewer than four debates upon the question of the armament, in which the right honourable gentleman involved this country, without condescending to explain the object which he had in view. The minority of this House stood forth against the monstrous measure of involving the country without unfolding the reason. The minister proudly and obstinately refused, and called on the majority to support him. We gave our opinion at large on the subject, and with effect, as it turned out, on the public mind. On that of the right honourable gentleman, however, we were not successful; for what was his conduct? He replied to us, "I hear what you say. I could answer all your charges; but I know my duty to my king too well to submit, at this moment, to expose the secrets of the State, and to lay the reasons before you of the measure on which I demand your confidence. I choose rather to lie for a time under all the imputations which you may heap upon me, trusting to the explanations which will come at last." Such was explicitly his language. However I might differ from the right honourable gentleman in opinion, I felt for his situation. There was in this excuse some shadow of reason by which it might be possible to defend him, when the whole of his conduct came to be investigated. I thought it hard to goad him, when, perhaps, he considered it as unsafe to expose what he was doing. But when the conclusion of the negotiation had loosed him from his fetters, when he had cast off the trammels that bound him, I thought that, like the horse described by Homer (if I remembered, I would quote the lines), exulting in the fresh pastures after he had freed himself from the bridle, the right honourable gentleman would have been eager to meet us with every sort of explanation and satisfaction.* I thought that, restrained by no delicacy, and panting only for the moment that was to restore him to the means of developing, and of expatiating upon every part of his conduct that was mysterious; of clearing up that which had been reprobated, of repelling on the heads of his adversaries those very accusations with which they had loaded him—the right honourable gentleman would have had but one wish, that of coming forward in a bold and manly manner and endeavouring to make his cause good against us in the face of the world. Has he done so? Has he even given us the means of inquiring fully and fairly into his conduct? No such thing. He lays before us a set of papers sufficient, indeed, as I shall contend, to found a strong criminal charge of misconduct against him, but evidently mutilated, garbled, and imperfect, with a view of precluding that full inquiry which his conduct demands, and which we had every reason to expect he would not have shrunk from on this day. We call for more. They are denied us. Why? "Because," say the gentlemen on the other side, "unless the papers now before you show there is ground for accusation, and unless you agree to accuse, it is not safe or proper to grant you more." But is this a defence for the right honourable gentleman? Do these papers exculpate him? Directly the reverse. *Prima facie* they condemn him. They afford us, in the first instance, the proof of disappointment. They show us that we have not obtained what we aimed to obtain; and they give us no justification of the right honourable gentleman for that disappointment. I have heard much ingenuity displayed to maintain that there was no guilt. But what is the fallacy of this argument? When we called for papers during the Spanish negotiation [as to Nootka Sound], we were answered "the negotiation was pending, and it was unsafe to grant them." Very well. But when it was over, and the same reasons for withholding them could not be said to exist, we were told, "Look to the result. The nation is satisfied with what we have got, and you must lay a ground of criminality before we can admit your principle of calling for papers." Thus we were precluded from all inquiry into that business. But now the right honourable gentleman, conscious that the country feels somewhat differently, admits the ground of criminality to have been laid by producing those documents on your table, imperfect as they are. It is from his own confession, therefore, that I am to pronounce him guilty, until he proves himself not to be so; and it is enough for me to contend that the papers now before us afford him *prima facie* no

* "Iliad," the sixth book, near the end:

"The wanton courser thus with reins unbound
Breaks from his stall, and beats the trembling ground;
Pampered and proud, he seeks the wonted tides,
And laves, in height of blood, his shining sides;
His head now freed, he tosses to the skies;
His mane dishevelled o'er his shoulders flies;
He snuffs the females in the distant plain,
And springs, exulting, to his fields again."—*Pope.*

justification, but, on the contrary, afford strong proof of his guilt, inasmuch as they evince a complete failure in the object he aimed to extort. Sir, the right honourable gentleman is sensible how much these circumstances render it necessary for him to take every possible advantage his situation can give him. Instead, therefore, of showing himself anxious to come forward, or thinking it his duty to explain why it was inconvenient or impolitic for him to state last year the true grounds on which he had called upon us to arm, what was the object of that armament, and why he had abandoned it, he lays a few papers on the table, and contents himself with an appeal unheard of before: "If you have anything to say against me, speak out, speak all. I will not say a word till you have done. Let me hear you one after another. I will have all the advantage of the game—none of you shall come behind me, for as soon as you have all thrown forth what you have to say, I will make a speech, which you shall not have an opportunity to contradict, and I will throw myself on my majority, that makes you dumb for ever." Such is the situation in which we stand, and such is the course which the right honourable gentleman thinks it honourable to pursue! I cheerfully yield to him the ground he chooses to occupy, and I will proceed, in obedience to the call personally addressed to me, frankly to state the reasons for the vote of censure, in which I shall this night agree.

I. Much argument has been used on topics not unfit, indeed, to be mixed with this question, but not necessary; topics which undoubtedly may be incidentally taken up, but which are not essential to the discussion. In this class I rank what has been said upon the balance of Europe. Whether the insulated policy which disdained all Continental connection whatever, as adopted at the beginning of the present reign —whether the system of extensive foreign connection, so eagerly insisted on by a young gentleman who spoke yesterday for the first time [Mr Jenkinson, afterward Lord Liverpool]—or whether the medium between these two be our interest, are certainly very proper topics to be discussed, but as certainly not *essential* topics to this question. Of the three, I confidently pronounce the middle line the true political course of this country. I think that, in our situation, every Continental connection is to be determined by its own merits. I am one of those who hold that a total inattention to foreign connections might be, as it has proved, very injurious to this country. But if I am driven to choose between the two extremes, between that of standing insulated and aloof from all foreign connections, and trusting for defence to our own resources, and that system as laid down in the speech of an honourable gentleman [Mr Jenkinson], who distinguished himself so much last night, to the extent to which he praised it, I do not hesitate to declare that my opinion is for the first of those situations. I should prefer even total disunion to that sort of connection, to preserve which we should be obliged to risk the blood and the resources of the country in every quarrel and every change that ambition or accident might bring about in any part of the Continent of Europe. But in the question before us, I deny that I am driven to either of these extremes. The honourable gentleman, who spoke with all the open ingenuousness, as well as the animation of youth, seemed himself to dread the extent to which his own doctrines would lead him. He failed, therefore, to sustain the policy of the system he described, in that part where it can alone apply, namely, to the degree in which it is necessary for us to support a balance of power. Holland, for instance, he states to be our natural ally. Granted. "To preserve Holland, and that she may not fall into the arms of France, we must make an alliance with Prussia." Good. But Prussia may be attacked by Austria. "Then we must make an alliance with the Ottoman Porte, that they may fall on Austria." Well, but the Porte may be attacked by Russia. "Then we must make an alliance with Sweden, that she may fall on Russia." By the way, I must here remind him that he totally forgot even to mention Poland, as if that country, now become in some degree able to act for itself, from the change in its constitution, was of no moment, or incapable of influencing in any manner this system of treaties and attacks. His natural ingenuity pointed out to him that, in casting up the account of all this, it would not produce a favourable balance for England, and he evaded the consequence of his own principle, by saying that *perhaps* Russia would not attack the Porte! "for when we speculate on extreme cases," says the honourable gentleman, "we have a right to make allowances. It is fair to expect that when we are in alliance with the Porte, Russia will feel too sensibly the importance of the commercial advantages she enjoys in her intercourse with this country to risk the loss of them by an attack on her." Are we, then, to suppose, in a scene of universal contest and warfare, that this ambitious power, who is reproached as perpetually and systematically aiming at the destruction of the Porte, and while the rest of Europe was at peace, has been in a state of restless and unceasing hostility with her, will then be the only power at peace, and let slip so favourable an opportunity of destroying her old enemy, simply because she is afraid of losing her trade with you in the Baltic? If the honourable gentleman means to state this as a rational conjecture, I would ask him to look to the fact. *Did* her sense of these advantages restrain her in the late war, or compel her to desist from the demands she made before we began to arm? Certainly not. We find, from

the documents before us, that she adhered to one uniform, steady course, from which neither the apprehension of commercial loss, nor the terrors of our arms, influenced her one moment to recede. What, then, are we to conclude from this intricate system of balances and counter-balances, and those dangerous theories with which the honourable gentleman seemed to amuse himself? Why, that these are speculations too remote from our policy; that in some parts, even according to the honourable gentleman's argument, they may be defective after all, and consequently, that if the system he builds upon it fails in one of its possibilities, it fails in the whole of them. Such must ever be the fate of systems so nicely constructed. But it is not true that the system necessary to enable this country to derive the true benefit from the Dutch alliance ought to be founded upon those involved and mysterious politics which make it incumbent upon us, nay, which prove its perfection, by compelling us to stand forward the principals in every quarrel, the Quixotes of every enterprise, the agitators in every plot, intrigue, and disturbance, which are every day arising in Europe to embroil one state of it with another. I confess that my opinions fall infinitely short of these perilous extremes; that possibly my genius is too scanty, and my understanding too limited and feeble, for the contemplation of their consequences; and that I can speculate no further than on connections immediately necessary to preserve us, safe and prosperous, from the power of our open enemies, and the encroachment of our competitors. This I hold to be the only test by which the merits of an alliance can be tried. I did think, for instance, that when the intrigues of France threatened to deprive us of our ancient ally, Holland, it was wise to interfere, and afterward to form an alliance by which that evil might be prevented. But to push the system further is pernicious. Every link in the chain of confederacies, which has been so widely expatiated upon by the member already alluded to, carries us more and more from the just point. By this extension the broad and clear lines of your policy become narrower and less distinct, until at last the very trace of them is lost.

Other topics have been introduced into the discussion. The beginning of the war between Russia and the Porte has been referred to. What possible connection that has with our armament I know not, but of that I shall have occasion to speak by and by.

II. I come, however, sir, to a question more immediately before us, and that is, the value and importance attached, in the minds of his Majesty's ministers, to the fortress of Oczakow; and here I must beg leave to say, that they have not once attempted to answer the arguments so judiciously and ably enforced by my honourable friend who made this motion. It was explicitly stated by the gentlemen on the other side, as the only argument for our interference at all, that the balance of Europe was threatened with great danger if Oczakow was suffered to remain in the hands of Russia. Of no less importance did ministers last year state this fortress of Oczakow, than as if it were indeed the *talisman* on which depended the fate of the whole Ottoman empire. But if this, from their own admission, was true last year, what has happened to alter its value? If it then excited the alarms of his Majesty's ministers for the safety of Europe, what can enable them now to tell us that we are perfectly secure? If it was true that her bare possession of Oczakow would be so dangerous, what must be the terror of Europe, when they see our negotiators put Russia into the way of seizing even Constantinople itself? This was the strong argument of my honourable friend [Mr Whitbread], and which he maintained with such solid reasoning that not the slightest answer has been given to it. To illustrate the value of Oczakow, however, one honourable gentleman [Mr Grant] went back to the reign of Elizabeth, and even to the days of Philip and Demosthenes. He told us that when Demosthenes, urging the Athenians to make war on Philip, reproached them with inattention to a few towns he had taken, the names of which they scarcely knew, telling them that those towns were the keys by which he would in time invade and overcome Greece, he gave them a salutary warning of the danger that impended. But if the opponents of that great orator had prevailed, if they had succeeded in inducing their countrymen to acquiesce in the surrender not only of those towns, but of considerably more, as in the present instance, with what face would he afterward have declared to his countrymen, "True it was that these sorry and nameless towns were the keys to the Acropolis itself; but you have surrendered them, and what is the consequence? You are now in a state of the most perfect security. You have now nothing to fear. You have now the prospect of sixteen years of peace before you!" I ask, sir, what would have been the reception even of Demosthenes himself, if he had undertaken to support such an inconsistency?

Let us try this, however, the other way. In order to show that his Majesty's ministers merit the censure which is proposed, I will admit that the preservation of the Turks *is* necessary for the security of a balance of power. I trust, at the same time, that this admission, which I make merely for the argument, will not be disingenuously quoted upon me, as hypothetical statements too commonly are, for admissions of fact. What will the right honourable gentleman gain by it? The Turks, by his arrangement, are left in a worse situation than he found them; for, previous to his interference, if Russia had gone to Constantinople, he would have been un-

fettered by the stipulations which bind him now, and he and his ally might have interfered to save the Porte from total destruction. But at present the possible and total extirpation of the Ottoman power is made to depend on a point so precarious as their accepting the proposal which the right honourable gentleman thought fit to agree to for them within the space of four months. And what is this proposal? Why, that the Turks should give up, not only the war they had begun, but this very Oczakow, which of itself was sufficient, in the hands of Russia, to overturn the balance. If, therefore, it was so important to recover Oczakow, it is not recovered, and ministers ought to be censured. If unimportant, they ought never to have demanded it. If so unimportant, they ought to be censured for arming; but if so important as they have stated it, they ought to be censured for disarming without having gotten it. Either way, therefore, the argument comes to the same point, and I care not on which side the gentlemen choose to take it up; for whether Oczakow be, as they told us last year, the key to Constantinople, on the preservation of which to Turkey the balance of Europe depended, or, as they must tell us now, of no comparative importance, their conduct is equally to be condemned for disarming, and pusillanimously yielding up the object, in the first instance; for committing the dignity of their sovereign, and hazarding the peace of their country, in the second.

But they tell us it is unfair to involve them in this dilemma. There was a middle course to be adopted. Oczakow was certainly of much importance; but this importance was to be determined upon by circumstances. Sir, we are become nice, indeed, in our political arithmetic. In this calculating age we ascertain to a scruple what an object is really worth. Thus it seems that Oczakow was worth an armament, but not worth a war; it was worth a threat, but not worth carrying that threat into execution! Sir, I can conceive nothing so degrading and dishonourable as such an argument. To hold out a menace without ever seriously meaning to enforce it, constitutes, in common language, the true description of a bully. Applied to the transactions of a nation, the disgrace is deeper, and the consequences fatal to its honour. Yet such is the precise conduct the king's ministers have made the nation hold in the eyes of Europe, and which they defend by an argument that, if urged in private life, would stamp a man with the character of a coward and a bully, and sink him to the deepest abyss of infamy and degradation. Sure I am that this distinction never suggested itself to the reflection of a noble duke [the Duke of Leeds], whose conduct throughout the whole of this business has evinced the manly character of his mind, unaccustomed to such calculations! From him we learn the fact. He said in his place that his colleagues thought it fit to risk a threat to recover Oczakow, but would not risk a war for it. Such conduct was not for him. It might suit the characters of his colleagues in office; it could not his. But they say it might be worth a war *with* the public opinion, but worth nothing *without* it! I cannot conceive any case in which a great and wise nation, having committed itself by a menace, can withdraw that menace without disgrace. The converse of the proposition I can easily conceive. That there may be a place, for instance, not fit to be asked at all, but which being asked for, and with a menace, it is fit to insist upon. This undoubtedly goes to make a nation, like an individual, cautious of committing itself, because there is no ground so tender as that of honour. How do ministers think on this subject? Oczakow was everything by itself; but when they added to Oczakow the honour of England, it became nothing! Oczakow, by itself, threatened the balance of Europe. Oczakow and national honour united weighed nothing in the scale! Honour is, in their political arithmetic, a *minus* quantity, to be subtracted from the value of Oczakow! Sir, I am ashamed of this reasoning; nor can I reflect on the foul stain it has fixed on the English name, without feeling mortified and humbled indeed! Their late colleague, the noble duke [of Leeds], urged his sentiments with the feelings that became him —feelings that form a striking contrast to those that actuate the right honourable gentleman. He told his country, that when he had made up his mind to the necessity of demanding Oczakow, it was his opinion that it might have been obtained without a war; but having once demanded it, he felt it his duty not to shrink from the war that might ensue from the rejection of that demand, and preferred the resignation of his office to the retracting that opinion. Far different was the conduct of the right honourable gentleman [Mr Pitt], though his advice was the same; and small were the scruples he felt in tarnishing the honour of his sovereign, whose name he pledged to this demand, and afterward obliged him to recede from it.

III. They tell us, however, and seem to value themselves much upon it, that, in abandoning the object for which they had armed, they acted in conformity to public opinion. Sir, I will fairly state my sentiments on this subject. It is right and prudent to consult the public opinion. It is frequently wise to attend even to public prejudices on subjects of such infinite importance, as whether they are to have war or peace. But if, in the capacity of a servant to the Crown, I were to see, or strongly to imagine that I saw, any measures going forward that threatened the peace or prosperity of the country, and if the emergency were so pressing as to demand the sudden adoption of a decisive course to avert the mischief, I should not hesitate one moment to act upon my own responsibility. If, however,

the public opinion did not happen to square with mine; if, after pointing out to them the danger, they did not see it in the same light with me; or if they conceived that another remedy was preferable to mine, I should consider it as due to my king, due to my country, due to my own honour, to *retire*, that they might pursue the plan which they thought better by a fit instrument—that is, by a man who thought with them. Such would be my conduct on any subject where conscientiously I could not surrender my judgment. If the case was doubtful, or the emergency not so pressing, I should be ready, perhaps, to sacrifice my opinion to that of the public; but one thing is most clear in such an event as this, namely, that I ought to give the public the means of forming an accurate estimate.

Do I state this difference fairly? If I do, and if the gentlemen over against me will admit that in the instance before us the public sentiment ought to have influenced them, it follows that the public sentiment ought to have been consulted before we were committed in the eyes of Europe, and that the country ought to have had the means and the information necessary to form their judgment upon the true merits of this question. Did the king's ministers act thus? Did they either take the public opinion, or did they give us the means of forming one? Nothing like it. On the 28th of March 1791, the message was brought down to this House. On the 29th we passed a vote of approbation, but no *opinion* was asked from us, no *explanation* was given us. So far from it, we were expressly told our advice was not wanted; that we had nothing to do with the prerogative of the Crown to make war; that all our business was to give confidence. So far with regard to this House. I cannot help thinking this conduct somewhat hard upon the majority, who certainly might have counted for something in the general opinion, when the right honourable gentleman was collecting it, if he meant fairly so to do. I grant, indeed, that there are many ways by which the feeling and temper of the public may be tolerably well known out of this House as well as in it. I grant that the opinion of a respectable meeting at Manchester, of a meeting at Norwich, of a meeting at Wakefield, of public bodies of men in different parts of England, might give the right honourable gentleman a correct idea of the public impression. Permit me to say also, that in the speeches of the minority of this House, he might find the ground of public opinion, both as to what might give it rise, and what might give it countenance. But was the *majority* of this House the only body whose dispositions were not worth consulting? Will the minister say, "I travelled to Norwich, to York, to Manchester, to Wakefield for opinions;" "I listened to the minority; I looked to Lord Stormont, to the Earl of Guilford; but as to you, my trusty majority, I neglected you! I had other business for you! It is not your office to give opinions; *your business is to confide!* You must pledge yourself, in the first instance, to all I can ask from you, and perhaps some time in the next year I may condescend to let you know the grounds on which you are acting." Such is the language he holds, if his conduct were to be explained by words, and a conduct more indecent or preposterous is not easily to be conceived; for it is neither more nor less than to tell us: "When I thought the Ottoman power in danger, I asked for an armament to succour it. You approved, and granted it to me. The public sense was against me, and, without minding you, I yielded to that sense. My opinion, however, remains still the same; though it must be confessed that I led you into giving a sanction to my schemes, by a species of reasoning, which it appears the country has saved itself by resisting. But they were to blame. I yet think that the exact contrary of what was done ought to have been done, and that the peace and safety of Europe depended upon it. But never mind how you voted, or how directly opposite to the general opinion, with which I complied, was that opinion I persuaded you to support. *Vote now that I was right in both;* in the opinion I still maintain, and in my compliance with its opposite! The peace of Europe is safe. *I keep my place, and all is right again.*"

But after all the right honourable gentleman did not act from any deference to the public opinion; and to prove this, I have but to recall to your recollection dates. The message was brought down, as I said before, on the 28th of March; and in less than a week, I believe in four days afterwards, before it was possible to collect the opinion of any one public body of men, their whole system was reversed. The change, therefore, could not come from the country, even had they been desirous of consulting it. But I have proved that they were not desirous to have an opinion from any quarter. They came down with their purposes masked and veiled to this House, and tried all they could to preclude inquiry into what they were doing. These are not the steps of men desirous of acting by opinion. I hold it, however, to be now acknowledged, that it was not the public opinion, but that of the minority in this House, which compelled the ministers to relinquish their ill-advised projects; for a right honourable gentleman, who spoke last night [Mr Dundas], confessed the truth in his own frank way. "We certainly," said he, "do not know that the opinion of the public was against us; we only know that a *great party* in this country was against us, and therefore we apprehended that, though one campaign might have been got through, at the beginning of the next session they would have interrupted us in procuring the supplies." I believe I quote the right honourable gentleman correctly. And here, sir, let me

pause, and thank him for the praise which he gives the gentlemen on this side the House. Let me indulge the satisfaction of reflecting, that though we have not the emoluments of office, nor the patronage of power, yet we are not excluded from great influence on the measures of government. We take pride to ourselves, that at this moment we are not sitting in a committee of supply, voting enormous fleets and armies to carry into execution this calamitous measure. To us he honestly declares this credit to be due; and the country will, no doubt, feel the gratitude they owe us for having saved them from the miseries of war.

An honourable gentleman, indeed [Mr Jenkinson], has told us that our opposition to this measure in its commencement occasioned its having been abandoned by the ministers; but he will not allow us the merit of having saved the country from a war by our interposition, but charges us with having prevented their obtaining the terms demanded, which would have been got without a war. I am glad to hear this argument; but must declare, in the name of the minority, that we think ourselves most unfairly treated by it, and forced into a responsibility that belongs in no manner whatsoever to our situation. The minister, when repeatedly pressed on this subject during the last session, was uniform in affirming that he had reasons for his conduct, to his mind so cogent and unanswerable, that he was morally certain of the indispensable necessity of the measures he was pursuing. He has said the same since, and to this hour continues his first conviction. If, therefore, the right honourable gentleman [Mr Pitt] thought so, and thought, at the same time, that our arguments were likely to mislead the country from its true interests, *why did he continue silent?* If public support was so necessary to him, that without it, as he tells us now, he could not proceed a single step, why did he suffer us to corrupt the passions, to blind and to pervert the understandings of the public, to a degree that compelled his sacrifice of this essential measure? Why did he quietly, and without concern, watch the prevalence of our false arguments? Why did he sanction their progress, by never answering them, when he knew the consequence must necessarily be to defeat his dearest object, and put the safety of his country to the hazard? Why did he not oppose some antidote to our poison? But, having neglected to do this (because of his duty to preserve state secrets, as he would have us believe), what semblance of right, what possible pretext has he to come forward now, and accuse *us* of thwarting his views, or to cast the responsibility of his failure and disgrace upon *us*, whose arguments he never answered, and to whom he obstinately and invariably refused all sort of information, by which we might have been enabled to form a better judgment, and possibly to agree with him on this subject? Another right honourable gentleman, however [Mr Dundas], judges more fairly of us, and I thank him for the handsome acknowledgment he paid to the true character of the gentlemen on this side of the House; for by owning that, because we did not happen to approve of this armament, it was abandoned, he acknowledges another fact—that we are not what another honourable gentleman [Mr Steele] chose to represent us, a *faction*, that indiscriminately approves of everything, right and wrong. This is clearly manifest from his own admissions; for, giving up when they found we condemned, they must have begun in the idea that we should approve. We approved in the case of Holland, and in that of Spain. In the first case we did so, because the rectitude of the thing was so clear and manifest, that every well-wisher to England must have done it. We did so in the case of Spain, because the objects were explained to us. The insult given, and the reparation demanded, were both before us. But had the right honourable gentleman any right, because we agreed to the Dutch and Spanish armaments, to anticipate the consent of opposition to the late one. It was insulting to impute the possibility to us! What, agree to take the money out of the pockets of the people, without an insult explained, or an object held up! It is said the object was stated, and that the means only were left to conjecture; that the *object* proposed to the House was an armament to make a peace, and Oczakow was supposed to be the *means* by which that peace was to be effected. Sir, it is almost constantly my misfortune to be differing from the right honourable gentleman [Mr Pitt] about the import of the words *object* and *means*. In my way of using these words, I should have directly transposed them, and called the armament the *means* of effecting peace, and Oczakow the *object* of that armament. And the event proves that ministers thought as I should have done; for they gave up that object, because they knew they could get the end they proposed by their armament without it. This object, indeed, whatever was its importance; whether it was or was not, as we have alternately heard it asserted and denied, the key of Constantinople; nay, as some wild and fanciful people had almost persuaded themselves, the key to our possessions in the East Indies, the king's ministers have completely renounced; and seem, by their conduct, to have cared very little what became of that or Constantinople itself. The balance of Europe, however, is perfectly safe, they tell us; and on that point we have nothing more to apprehend. The enormous accession of power to Russia, from the possession of Oczakow, so far from affecting Great Britain, is not likely, according to what the ministers must assure us, to disturb the tranquillity of her nearest neighbours. That Oczakow, therefore,

was at any time an object sufficient to justify their interference, I have stated many reasons for concluding will not be alleged this night.

IV. Some of the gentlemen on the other side, indeed, have advanced other grounds, and told us (I confess it is for the first time) that in this war the Empress of Russia was the aggressor; that on her part the war was offensive; and that it became us to interfere to stop her progress. They tell us of various encroachments in the Kuban [a part of Tartary], of hostilities systematically carried on in violation of treaties, and many other instances; not one of which they have attempted to prove by a single document, or have rested on any other foundation than their own assertions. But to these, sir, I shall oppose the authority of ministers themselves; for, in one of the despatches of the Duke of Leeds to Mr Whitworth [British minister to Russia], he desires him to communicate to the court of Petersburgh, that if they will consent to make peace with the Turks on the *status quo*, the allies will consent to guarantee the Crimea to them, "*the object of the war*," as he states it to be. I desire no further proof than this, that we always considered the Turks as the aggressors; for it follows, that where any place in the possession of one power is made the object of a war by another, the power claiming that object is the aggressor. If, for example, we were at war with Spain, and Gibraltar the object, Spain, of course, would be the aggressor; the contrary, if the Havana were the object. The King of England, therefore, by the despatch which I have quoted, has, in words and in fact, acknowledged the Turks to have been the aggressors in this war, by making pretensions to a province solemnly ceded to Russia in the year 1783. I can scarcely think that ministers mean to contend that cession by treaty does not give right to possession. Where are we to look, therefore, to ascertain the right of a country to any place or territory, but to the *last* treaty? To what would the opposite doctrine lead? France might claim Canada, ceded in 1763, or we Tobago, ceded in 1783. It might be urged that they took advantage of our dispute with our own colonies, and that the treaty gave no right. Canada, Jamaica, everything, might be questioned. Where would be the peace of Europe, if these doctrines were to be acted on? Every country must continue in a state of endless perplexity, armament, and preparations. But, happily for mankind, a different principle prevails in the law of nations. There the last treaty gives the right; and upon that we must aver, that if, as the despatch says, the Crimea was the object, the *Turk was the aggressor.*

V. What, therefore, was the right claimed by the right honourable gentleman to enter into this dispute? I will answer. The right of a proud man, anxious to play a lofty part. France had gone off the stage. The character of the miserable disturber of empires was vacant, and he resolved to boast and vapour, and play his antic tricks and gestures on the same theatre. And what has been the first effect of this new experiment upon the British nation? That, in the pride and zenith of our power, we have miserably disgraced ourselves in the eyes of Europe; that the name of his Majesty has been sported with, and stained; that the people of England have been inflamed, their commerce disturbed, the most valuable citizens dragged from their houses [by press-warrants], and half a million of money added to the public burdens. And here, sir, in justice to my own feelings, I cannot pass over wholly in silence the fate of that valuable body of our fellow-citizens who are more particularly the victims of these false alarms, and by whom the most bitter portion of the common calamity must be borne. I am compelled to admit that every state has a right, in the season of danger, to claim the services of all or any of its members; that the "*salus populi suprema lex est.*" Tenderness and consideration in the use of such extensive powers is all I can recommend to those whose business it is to call them into action. But here I must lament, in common with every feeling mind, that unnecessary barbarity which dragged them from their homes, deprived them of their liberty, and tore them from the industrious exercise of those modes of life by which they earned support for their families, wantonly, cruelly, and without pretext, because *without the smallest intention of employing them.* The gentlemen well know what I state to be a fact; for they know that their system was changed, and their object abandoned, before even they had begun to issue press-warrants!

VI. I return, sir, to the disgraceful condition in which the right honourable gentleman has involved us. Let us see whether what I have said on this point be not literally true. The Empress of Russia offered, early in the year 1790, to depart from the terms she had at first thrown out, namely, that Bessarabia, Wallachia, and Moldavia should be independent of the Ottoman power. This, it appears, she yielded upon the amicable representations of the allied powers, and substituted in the room of them those conditions which have since been conceded to her, namely, that the Dniester should be the boundary between the two empires, and all former treaties should be confirmed. "Then," say ministers, "if we gained this by simple negotiation, what may we not gain by an armament?" Thus judging of her pusillanimity by their own, they threatened her. What did she do? Peremptorily refused to depart one atom from her last conditions; and this determination, I assert, was in the possession of his Majesty's ministers long before the armament. They knew not only this, early in the month of March 1791, but likewise the resolution of the

empress not to rise in her demands, notwithstanding any further success that might attend her arms. The memorial of the court of Denmark, which they have, for reasons best known to themselves, refused us, but which was circulated in every court, and published in every newspaper in Europe, fully informed them of these matters. But the king's ministers, with an absurdity of which there is no example, called upon the country to arm. Why? Not because they meant to employ the armament against her, but in the fanciful hope that, because, in an amicable negotiation, the empress had been prevailed upon not to press the demand of Wallachia, Moldavia, and Bessarabia as independent sovereignties, they should infallibly succeed by arming, and not employing that armament, in persuading her to abandon all the rest! And what was the end? Why, that after pledging the king's name in the most deliberate and solemn manner; after lofty vapouring, menacing, promising, denying, turning, and turning again; after keeping up the parade of an armament for four months, accompanied with those severe measures [pressing seamen, etc.], to be regretted even when necessary, to be reprobated when not, the right honourable gentleman crouches humbly at her feet; entreats, submissively supplicates of her moderation, that she will grant him some small trifle of what he asks, if it is but by way of a boon; and finding at last that he can get nothing, either by threats or his prayers, gives up the whole precisely as she insisted upon having it!

The right honourable gentleman, however, is determined that this House shall take the whole of this disgrace upon itself. I heard him with much delight, on a former day, quote largely from that excellent and philosophical work, "The Wealth of Nations." In almost the first page of that book he will find it laid down as a principle that, by a division of labour in the different occupations of life, the objects to which it is applied are perfected, time is saved, dexterity improved, and the general stock of science augmented; that by joint effort and reciprocal accommodation the severest tasks are accomplished, and difficulties surmounted, too stubborn for the labour of a single hand. Thus, in the building of a great palace, we observe the work to be parcelled out into different departments, and distributed and subdivided into various degrees, some higher, some lower, to suit the capacities and condition of those who are employed in its construction. There is the architect that invents the plan, and erects the stately columns. There is the dustman and the nightman to clear away the rubbish. The right honourable gentleman applies these principles to his politics; and, in the division and cast of parts for the job we are now to execute for him, has reserved for himself the higher and more respectable share of the business, and leaves all the dirty work to us. Is he asked why the House of Commons made the armament last year? He answers, "The House of Commons did not make the armament! I made it. The House of Commons only approved of it." Is he asked why he gave up the object of the armament, after he had made it? "I did not give it up!" he exclaims. "I think the same of its necessity as ever. It is the House of Commons that gives it up! It is the House that supports the nation in their senseless clamour against my measures. It is to this House that you must look for the shame and guilt of your disgrace." To himself he takes the more conspicuous character of menacer. It is he that distributes provinces and limits empires; while he leaves to this House the humbler office of licking the dust, and begging forgiveness;

> "Not mine these groans—
> These sighs that issue, or these tears that flow."

"I am forced into these submissions by a low, contracted, grovelling, mean-spirited, and ignorant people!" But this is not all. It rarely happens that in begging pardon (when men determine upon that course) they have not some benefit in view, or that the profit to be got is not meant to counterbalance, in some measure, the honour to be sacrificed. Let us see how the right honourable gentleman managed this. On the first indication of hostile measures against Russia, one hundred and thirty-five members of this House divided against the adoption of them. This it was, according to a right honourable gentleman who spoke in the debate yesterday [Mr Dundas], that induced ministers to abandon their first object; but not like the Duke of Leeds, who candidly avowed that, if he could have once brought himself to give up the claim of Oczakow, he would not have stood out for the razing its fortifications, or any such terms. The ministers determine that the nation at least shall reap no benefit from the reversal of their system. "You have resisted our projects," say they; "you have discovered and exposed our incapacity; you have made us the ridicule of Europe, and such we shall appear to posterity; you have defeated, indeed, our intentions of involving you in war; but *you* shall not be the gainers by it! you shall not save your money! We abandon Oczakow, as you compel us to do: but we will keep up the armament if it is only to spite you!"

Determined to act this dishonourable part, their next care was to do it in the most disgraceful manner; and as they had dragged Parliament and their king through the dirt and mire, they resolved to exhibit them in this offensive plight to the eyes of Europe. To do this, they did not care to trust to the minister we had at Petersburgh—a gentleman distinguished for amiable manners, and by the faithful, the vigilant, and the able discharge of his duty. Why

was the management of the negotiation taken from him? Was he too proud for this service? No man is too proud to do his duty; and of all our foreign ministers, Mr Whitworth * I should think the very last to whom it could be reproached that he is remiss in fulfilling the directions he receives, in their utmost strictness. But a new man was to be found; one whose reputation for talents and honour might operate, as they hoped, as a sort of set-off against the incapacity he was to cure, and the national honour he was deputed to surrender. Was it thus determined, because, in looking round their diplomatic body, there was no man to be selected from it, whose character assimilated with the dirty job he was to execute? As there was honour to be sacrificed, a stain to be fixed upon the national character, engagements to be retracted, and a friend to be abandoned, did it never occur to them that there was *one man* upon their diplomatic list who would have been pronounced by general acclamation thoroughly qualified in soul and qualities for this service? Such a person they might have found, and not so occupied as to make it inconvenient to employ him. They would have found him absent from his station, under the pretence of attending his duty in this House, though he does not choose often to make his appearance here.† Instead of this, however, they increased the dishonour that they doomed us to suffer, by sending a gentleman endowed with every virtue and accomplishment, who had acquired, in the service of the Empress of Russia, at an early period of his life, a character for bravery and enterprise that rendered him personally esteemed by her, and in whom fine talents and elegant manners, ripened by habit and experience, had confirmed the flattering promise of his youth. Did they think that the shabbiness of their message was to be done away by the worth of the messenger? If I were to send a humiliating apology to any person, would it change its quality by being entrusted to Lord Rodney, Admiral Pigot, my honourable friend behind me [General Burgoyne], Lord Cornwallis, Sir Henry Clinton, Sir William Howe, or any other gallant and brave officer? Certainly not.

It was my fortune, in very early life, to have set out in habits of particular intimacy with Mr Faulkener, and however circumstances may have intervened to suspend that intimacy, circumstances arising from wide differences in political opinion, they never have altered the sentiments of private esteem which I have uniformly felt for him; and with every amiable and conciliating quality that belongs to man, I know him to be one from whom improper submissions are the least to be expected. Well, sir, these gentlemen, Mr Whitworth and Mr Faulkener, commence the negotiation by the offer of three distinct propositions, each of them better than the other, and accompany it with an expression somewhat remarkable, namely, that this negotiation is to be as unlike all the others as possible, and to be "*founded in perfect candour.*" To prove this, they submit at once to the Russian ministers "all that their instructions enable them to propose." Who would not have imagined, according to the plain import of these words, that unless the empress had assented to one of these propositions, all amicable interposition would have been at an end, and war the issue? The "perfect candour" promised in the beginning of their note, leads them to declare explicitly, that unless the fortifications of Oczakow be razed, or the Turks are allowed, as an equivalent, to keep both the banks of the Dniester, the allies cannot propose any terms to them. What answer do they receive? An unequivocal rejection of every one of their propositions; accompanied, however, with a declaration, to which I shall soon return, that the navigation of that river shall be free to all the world, and a reference to those maxims of policy which have invariably actuated the Empress of Russia in her intercourse with neutral nations, whose commerce she has at all times protected and encouraged. With this declaration the British plenipotentiaries declare themselves perfectly contented; nay more, they engage that if the Turks should refuse these conditions, and continue obstinate longer than four months, the allied courts "will abandon the termination of the war to the events it may produce." And here ends for ever all care for the Ottoman empire, all solicitude about the balance of power. The right honourable gentleman will interpose no further to save either, but rests the whole of a measure, once so indispensable to *our* safety, upon this doubtful issue, whether the Turks will accept in December those very terms which in July the British ministers *could not venture to propose to them!*

Sir, we may look in vain to the events of former times for a disgrace parallel to what we have suffered. Louis XIV., a monarch often named in our debates, and whose reign exhibits more than any other the extremes of prosperous and of adverse fortune, never, in the midst of his most humiliating distresses, stooped to so despicable a sacrifice of all that can be dear to man. The war of the succession, unjustly begun by him, had reduced his power, had swallowed up his armies and his navies, had desolated his provinces, had drained his treasures, and deluged the earth with the blood of the best and most faithful of his subjects. Exhausted by his various calamities, he offered his enemies at one time to relinquish all the objects for which he had begun the war. That proud monarch sued for peace, and was content to receive it from our moderation. But when it was made a condition of that peace, that he should turn his

* Afterward Lord Whitworth, and ambassador at the court of Bonaparte during the peace of Amiens.

† Lord Auckland

arms against his grandson, and compel him by force to relinquish the throne of Spain, humbled, exhausted, conquered as he was, misfortune had not yet bowed his spirit to conditions so hard as these. We know the event. He persisted still in the war, until the folly and wickedness of Queen Anne's ministers enabled him to conclude the peace of Utrecht, on terms considerably less disadvantageous even than those he had himself proposed. And shall *we*, sir, the pride of our age, the terror of Europe, submit to this humiliating sacrifice of our honour? Have *we* suffered a defeat at Blenheim? Shall we, with our increasing prosperity, our widely diffused capital, our navy, the just subject of our common exultation, ever-flowing coffers, that enable us to give back to the people what, in the hour of calamity, we were compelled to take from them; flushed with a recent triumph over Spain [respecting Nootka Sound], and yet more than all, while our old rival and enemy was incapable of disturbing us, shall it be for us to yield to what France disdained in the hour of her sharpest distress, and exhibit ourselves to the world, the sole example in its annals of such an abject and pitiful degradation?

VII. But gentlemen inform us now, in justification, as I suppose they mean it, of all these measures, that to effect a peace between Russia and the Porte was only the ostensible cause of our armament, or at least was not the sole cause; and that ministers were under some apprehension lest the Emperor of Germany, if the allies were to disarm, should insist on better terms from the Turks than he had agreed to accept by the convention of Reichenbach. This I cannot believe. When his Majesty sends a message to inform his Parliament that he thinks it necessary to arm for a specific purpose, I cannot suppose that a *falsehood* has been put into his Majesty's mouth, and that the armament which he proposes as necessary for one purpose is intended for another! If the right honourable gentleman shall tell me, that although the war between Russia and the Porte was the real cause of equipping the armament, yet that being once equipped, it was wise to keep it up when no longer wanted on that account, because the emperor seemed inclined to depart from the convention of Reichenbach; then I answer, that it was his duty to have come with a second message to Parliament, expressly stating this new object, with the necessary information to enable the House to judge of its propriety. Another of the arguments for continuing the armament after the object was relinquished, is, that Russia might have insisted on harder terms, not conceiving herself bound by offers which we had refused to accept. I perfectly agree with gentlemen, that after the repeated offer of those terms on the part of Russia, and the rejection of them by us, the empress was not bound to adhere to them in all possible events and contingencies. If the war had continued, she would have had a right to further indemnification for the expense of it. But was it not worth the minister's while to try the good faith of the Empress of Russia, after she had so solemnly pledged herself to all Europe that she would *not* rise in her demands? The experiment would have been made with little trouble, by the simple expedient of sending a messenger to ask the question. The object of his armament would have suffered little by the delay, as an answer from the Russian court might have been had in five or six weeks. Was it reasonable in ministers to suppose, that because, in the early part of the negotiation, the empress had shown so much regard to us as actually to give up whatever pretensions she had formed to other provinces of the Turkish empire, solely with the view of obtaining our concurrence to the principle on which she offered to make peace, she would revert to those very pretensions the instant she had obtained that concurrence on our part, for the benefit of which she had sacrificed them? Surely, as I have said, it was worth while to make the experiment; but simple and obvious as this was, a very different course was adopted. Oczakow, indeed, was relinquished *before* the armament began, as we may find by comparing the date of the press warrants with that of the Duke of Leeds' resignation. As soon as the king's message was delivered to Parliament, a messenger was despatched to Berlin with an intimation of the resolution to arm. This, perhaps, was rashly done, as the ministry might have foreseen that the measure would probably meet with opposition, and much time could not have been lost by waiting the event of the first debate. No sooner was the division [upon the debate] known, than a second messenger was sent off to overtake and stop the despatches of the first; and this brings me to another argument, which I confess appears to me very unlikely to help them out. They tell us that the King of Prussia having armed in consequence of our assurances of support, we could not disarm before we knew the sentiments of the court of Berlin, without the imputation of leaving our ally in the lurch. Did we wait for the sentiments of that court to determine whether Oczakow was to be given up or not? Sir, when that measure was resolved upon, *the right honourable gentleman actually had abandoned his ally;* and that such was the sense of the court of Berlin, I believe can be testified by every Englishman who was there at the time. No sooner did the second messenger arrive, and the contents of his despatches become known, than a general indignation rose against the conduct of the right honourable gentleman; and I am well enough informed on the subject to state to this House, that not an Englishman could show his face in that capital without exposing himself to mortification, perhaps to insult. But, between the 28th of March 1791, when the mes-

sage was brought down to this House, and the 2d or 3d of April, when the second messenger was despatched with the news that ministers had abandoned the object of it, the armament could not have been materially advanced. Why, then, was it persisted in? The right honourable gentleman cannot argue that he kept up the armament in compliance with his engagements with Prussia, when the armament, in fact, did not exist, and when it had been begun but four or five days previous to his renouncing the object of it. That could not have been his motive. What then was the motive? Why, that he was too proud to own his error, and valued less the money and tranquillity of the people than the appearance of firmness, when he had renounced the reality. False shame is the parent of many crimes. By false shame a man may be tempted to commit a murder, to conceal a robbery. Influenced by this false shame, the ministers robbed the people of their money, the seamen of their liberty, their families of support and protection, and all this to conceal that they had undertaken a system which was not fit to be pursued. If they say that they did this, apprehensive that, without the terror of an armament, Russia would not stand to the terms which they had refused to accept, they do no more than acknowledge that, by the insolence of their arming and the precipitancy of their submission, they had either so provoked her resentment, or excited her contempt, that she would not even condescend to agree to her own propositions when approved by them. But however they might have thought her disposed to act on this subject, it was at least their duty to try whether such would have been her conduct or not.

VIII. To prove that the terms to which they agreed at last were the same with those they before rejected, all I feel it necessary for me to observe is, that the free navigation of the river Dniester, the only novelty introduced into them, was implied in proposing it as a boundary; for it is a well-known rule that the boundary between two powers must be as free to the one as to the other. True, says the minister, but we have got the free navigation for the subjects of other powers, particularly for those of Poland. If this be an advantage, it is one which he has gained by concession; for if he had not agreed that the river should be the boundary, the navigation would not have been free. The Turks offered no such stipulation, had they been put in possession of both the banks. Besides which, as a noble duke, whom I have already quoted, well observed, it is an advantage, whatever may be its value, which can subsist only in time of peace. It is not, I suppose, imagined that the navigation will be free in time of war. They have, then, got nothing that deserves the name of a "modification," a term, I must here observe, the use of which is not justified even by the original memorial, where the sense is more accurately expressed by the French word "*radoucissement.*" Was it, then, for some *radoucissement* [softening] that they continued their armament? Was it to say to the empress, when they had conceded everything, "We have given you all you asked, give us something that we may hold out to the public, something that we may use against the minority, that minority whom we have endeavoured to represent as your allies. We have sacrificed our allies, the Turks, to you. You can do no less than sacrifice your allies, the minority, to us?" If I had been to advise the empress on the subject, I would have counselled her to grant the British minister something of this sort. I would even have advised her to raze the fortifications of Oczakow, if he had insisted on it. I would have appealed from her policy to her generosity, and said, "Grant him this as an *apology*, for he stands much in need of it. His whole object was to appear to gain something, no matter what, by continuing the armament; and even in this last pitiful and miserable object he has failed." If, after all, I ask, whether these terms *are* contained in the peace that we have concluded for the Turks, or rather which the Turks concluded for themselves, the answer is, "We have no authentic copy of it." Is this what we have got by our arms, by distressing our commerce, dragging our seamen from their homes and occupations, and squandering our money? Is this the efficacy of our interference, and the triumph of our wisdom and our firmness? The Turks have at length concluded a peace, of which they do not even condescend to favour us with a copy, so that we know what it is only by report, and the balance of Europe, late in so much danger, and of so much importance, is left for them to settle without consulting us! Is it for this that we employed such men as Mr Faulkener and Mr Whitworth? They were sent to negotiate for the materials of a speech, and failed. But what are the complaints that private friendship has a right to make, compared with those of an insulted public? Half a million of money is spent, the people alarmed and interrupted in their proper pursuits by the apprehension of a war, and for what? For the restoration of Oczakow? No! Oczakow is not restored. To save the Turks from being too much humbled? No. They are now in a worse situation than they would have been had we never armed at all. If Russia had persevered in that system of encroachment of which she is accused, we could, as I observed before, then have assisted them unembarrassed. We are now tied down by treaties, and fettered by stipulations. We have even guaranteed to Russia what we before said it would be unsafe for the Turks to yield, and dangerous to the peace of Europe for Russia to possess. This is what the public have got by the armament. What, then, was the *private motive?*

"Scilicet, ut Turno contingat regia conjux,
Nos, animæ viles, inhumata infletaque turba,
Sternamur campis."

("That Turnus may obtain a royal spouse,
We abject souls, unburied and unwept,
Lie scattered on the plains.")

—*Æneid of Virgil*, xi. 371.

IX. The minister gained, or thought he was to gain, an excuse for his rashness and misconduct; and to purchase this excuse was the public money and the public quiet wantonly sacrificed. There are some effects, which to combine with their causes, is almost sufficient to drive men mad! That the pride, the folly, the presumption of a single person shall be able to involve a whole people in wretchedness and disgrace, is more than philosophy can teach mortal patience to endure. Here are the true weapons of the enemies of our constitution! Here may we search for the source of those seditious writings, meant either to weaken our attachment to the constitution, by depreciating its value, or which loudly tell us that we have no constitution at all. We may blame, we may reprobate such doctrines; but while we furnish those who circulate them with arguments such as these; while the example of this day shows us to what degree the fact is true, we must not wonder if the purposes they are meant to answer be but too successful. They argue that a constitution cannot be right where such things are possible, much less so when they are practised without punishment. This, sir, is a serious reflection to every man who loves the constitution of England. Against the vain theories of men, who project fundamental alterations upon grounds of mere speculative objection, I can easily defend it; but when they recur to these facts, and show me how we may be doomed to all the horrors of war by the caprice of an individual who will not even condescend to explain his reasons, I can only fly to this House, and exhort you to rouse from your lethargy of confidence into the active mistrust and vigilant control which is your duty and your office. Without recurring to the dust to which the minister has been humbled, and the dirt he has been dragged through, if we ask, for what has the peace of the public been disturbed? for what is that man pressed and dragged like a felon to a service that *should* be honourable? we must be answered, for some three-quarters of a mile of barren territory on the banks of the Dniester! In the name of all we value, give us, when such instances are quoted in derogation of our constitution, some right to answer, that these are not its principles, but the monstrous abuses intruded into its practice. Let it not be said, that because the executive power, for an adequate and evident cause, may adopt measures that require expense without consulting Parliament, we are to convert the exception into a rule; to reverse the principle; and that it is now to be assumed that the people's money may be spent for any cause, or for none, without either submitting the exigency to the judgment of their representatives, or inquiring into it afterwards, unless we can make out ground for a criminal charge against the executive government. Let us disclaim these abuses, and return to the constitution.

I am not one of those who lay down rules as universal and absolute, because I think there is hardly a political or moral maxim which is universally true; but I maintain the general rule to be, that before the public money be voted away, the occasion that calls for it should be fairly stated, for the consideration of those who are the proper guardians of the public money. Had the minister explained his system to Parliament before he called for money to support it, and Parliament had decided that it was not worth supporting, he would have been saved the mortification and disgrace in which his own honour is involved, and, by being furnished with a just excuse to Prussia for withdrawing from the prosecution of it, have saved that of his sovereign and his country, which he has irrevocably tarnished. Is unanimity necessary to his plans? He can be sure of it in no manner, unless he explains them to this House, who are certainly much better judges than he is of the degree of unanimity with which they are likely to be received. Why, then, did he not consult us? Because he had other purposes to answer in the use he meant to make of his majority. Had he opened himself to the House at first, and had we declared against him, he might have been stopped in the first instance: had we declared for him, we might have held him too firmly to his principle to suffer his receding from it as he has done. Either of these alternatives he dreaded. It was his policy to decline our opinions, and to exact our confidence; that thus having the means of acting either way, according to the exigencies of his personal situation, he might come to Parliament and tell us what our opinions ought to be; which set of principles would be most expedient to shelter him from inquiry and from punishment. It is for this he comes before us with a poor and pitiful excuse, that for want of the unanimity he expected, there was reason to fear, if the war should go to a second campaign, that it might be obstructed. Why not speak out, and own the real fact? He feared that a second campaign might occasion the loss of his place. Let him keep but his place, he cares not what else he loses. With other men, reputation and glory are the objects of ambition; power and place are coveted but as the means of these. For the minister, power and place are sufficient of themselves. With them he is content; for them he can calmly sacrifice every proud distinction that ambition covets, and every noble prospect to which it points the way!

X. Sir, there is yet an argument which I have

not sufficiently noticed. It has been said, as a ground for his defence, that he was prevented from gaining what he demanded by our opposition; and, but for this, Russia would have complied, and never would have hazarded a war. Sir, I believe the direct contrary, and my belief is as good as their assertion, unless they will give us some proof of its correctness. Until then, I have a right to ask them, what if Russia had not complied? Worse and worse for him! He must have gone on, redoubling his menaces and expenses, the Empress of Russia continuing inflexible as ever, but for the salutary opposition which preserved him from his extremity of shame. I am not contending that armaments are never necessary to enforce negotiations; but it is one, and that not the least, of the evils attending the right honourable gentleman's misconduct, that by keeping up the parade of an armament, never meant to be employed, he has, in a great measure, deprived us of the use of this method of negotiating, whenever it may be necessary to apply it effectually; for if you propose to arm in concert with any foreign power, that power will answer, "What security can you give me that you will persevere in that system? You say you cannot go to war unless your people are unanimous." If you aim to negotiate against a foreign power, that power will say, "I have only to persist—the British minister may threaten, but he dare not act—he will not hazard the loss of his place by a war." A right honourable gentleman [Mr Dundas], in excuse for withholding papers, asked what foreign power would negotiate with an English cabinet, if their secrets were likely to be developed, and exposed to the idle curiosity of a House of Commons? I do not dread such a consequence, but if I must be pushed to extremes, if nothing were left me but an option between opposite evils, I should have no hesitation in choosing. "Better have no dealings with them at all," I should answer, "if the right of inquiry into every part of a negotiation they think fit, and of knowing why they are to vote the money of their constituents, be denied the House of Commons." But there is something like a reason why no foreign power will negotiate with us, and that a much better reason than a dread of disclosing their secrets, in the right honourable gentleman's example. I declare, therefore, for the genius of our constitution, against the practice of his Majesty's ministers; I declare that the duties of this House are, vigilance in preference to secrecy, deliberation in preference to despatch. Sir, I have given my reasons for supporting the motion for a vote of censure on the minister. I will listen to his defence with attention, and I will retract wherever he shall prove me to be wrong.

[The debate was closed by Pitt, who insisted on the necessity of restraining the ambition of Russia. The vote was taken; it stood 244 in his favour, and 116 against him. The same jealousy at the growing power of Russia, which animated the Government at that time, seems to have been repeated and preserved during the agitation upon the Eastern question, 1876-77.]

JOHN PHILPOT CURRAN.

1750-1817.

A VINDICATION OF IRISH PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.*

GENTLEMEN,—The representation of your people is the vital principle of their political existence. Without it they are dead, or they live only in servitude. Without it there are two estates acting upon and against the third, instead of acting in co-operation with it. Without it, if the people are oppressed by their judges, where is the tribunal to which their judges can be amenable? Without it, if they are trampled upon and plundered by a minister, where is the tribunal to which the offender shall be amenable? Without it, where is the ear to hear, or the heart to feel, or the hand to redress their sufferings? Shall they be found, let me ask you, in the accursed bands of imps and minions that bask in their disgrace, and fatten upon their spoils, and flourish upon their ruin? But let me not put this to you as a merely speculative question. It is a plain question of fact; rely upon it, physical man is everywhere the same; it is only the various operations of moral causes that gives variety to the social or individual character and condition. How otherwise happens it that modern slavery looks quietly at the despot, on the very spot where Leonidas expired? The answer is easy; Sparta has not changed her climate, but she has lost that government which her liberty could not survive.

I call you, therefore, to the plain question of fact. This paper recommends a reform in Parliament: I put that question to your conscience; do you think it needs that reform? I put it boldly and fairly to you; do you think the people of Ireland are represented as they

* From a speech in behalf of Michael Hamilton Rowan, when indicted for the publication of a seditious libel, delivered 20th January 1794.

ought to be? Do you hesitate for an answer? If you do, let me remind you that, until the last year, three millions of your countrymen have, by the express letter of the law, been excluded from the reality of actual, and even from the phantom of virtual representation. Shall we, then, be told that this is only the affirmation of a wicked and seditious incendiary? If you do not feel the mockery of such a charge, look at your country; in what state do you find it? Is it in a state of tranquillity and general satisfaction? These are traces by which good are ever to be distinguished from bad governments, without any very minute inquiry or speculative refinement. Do you feel that a veneration for the law, a pious and humble attachment to the constitution, form the political morality of the people? Do you find that comfort and competency among your people which are always to be found where a government is mild and moderate, where taxes are imposed by a body who have an interest in treating the poorer orders with compassion, and preventing the weight of taxation from pressing sore upon them?

Gentlemen, I mean not to impeach the state of your representation; I am not saying that it is defective, or that it ought to be altered or amended; nor is this a place for me to say whether I think that three millions of the inhabitants of a country, whose whole number is but four, ought to be admitted to any efficient situation in the state. It may be said, and truly, that these are not questions for either of us directly to decide; but you cannot refuse them some passing consideration, at least when you remember that on this subject the real question for your decision is, whether the allegation of a defect in your constitution is so utterly unfounded and false, that you can ascribe it only to the malice and perverseness of a wicked mind, and not to the innocent mistake of an ordinary understanding; whether it may not be mistake; whether it can be only sedition?

And here, gentlemen, I own I cannot but regret that one of our countrymen should be criminally pursued for asserting the necessity of a reform, at the very moment when that necessity seems admitted by the Parliament itself; that this unhappy reform shall, at the same moment, be a subject of legislative discussion and criminal prosecution. Far am I from imputing any sinister design to the virtue or wisdom of our Government; but who can avoid feeling the deplorable impression that must be made on the public mind when the demand for that reform is answered by a criminal information! I am the more forcibly impressed by this consideration, when I consider that when this information was first put on the file, the subject was transiently mentioned in the House of Commons. Some circumstance retarded the progress of the inquiry there, and the progress of the information was equally retarded here. On the first day of the session you all know that subject was again brought forward in the House of Commons, and, as if they had slept together, this prosecution was also revived in the Court of King's Bench, and that before a jury taken from a panel partly composed of those very Members of Parliament who, in the House of Commons, must debate upon this subject as a measure of public advantage, which they are here called upon to consider as a public crime.*

This paper, gentlemen, insists upon the necessity of emancipating the Catholics of Ireland, and that is charged as a part of the libel. If they had kept this prosecution impending for another year, how much would remain for a jury to decide upon, I should be at a loss to discover. It seems as if the progress of public reformation was eating away the ground of the prosecution. Since the commencement of the prosecution this part of the libel has unluckily received the sanction of the legislature. In that interval our Catholic brethren have obtained that admission which, it seems, it was a libel to propose.† In what way to account for this I am really at a loss. Have any alarms been occasioned by the emancipation of our Catholic brethren? Has the bigoted malignity of any individuals been crushed? Or has the stability of the Government, or has that of the country, been weakened? Or are one million of subjects stronger than four millions? Do you think that the benefit they received should be poisoned by the sting of vengeance? If you think so you must say to them, "You have demanded emancipation, and you have got it; but we abhor your persons, we are outraged at your success; and we will stigmatise, by a criminal prosecution, the relief which you have obtained from the voice of your country." I ask you, gentlemen, do you think, as honest men anxious for the public tranquillity, conscious that there are wounds not yet completely cicatrised, that you ought to speak this language, at this time, to men who are too much disposed to think that in this very emancipation they have been saved from their own Parliament by the humanity of their sovereign? Or do you wish to prepare them for the revocation of these improvident concessions? Do you think it wise or human at this moment to insult them, by sticking up in a pillory the man who dared to stand forth their advocate? I put it to your oaths, do you think that a blessing of that kind, that a victory obtained by justice over bigotry and oppression, should have a stigma

* The jury was taken from a panel containing the names of a number of Members of Parliament.

† In 1793, after the prosecution was commenced, the Irish Parliament passed a bill giving the right of suffrage to Catholics, and conferring a large part of the rights and privileges desired.

cast upon it by an ignominious sentence upon men bold and honest enough to propose that measure? To propose the redeeming of religion from the abuses of the Church, the reclaiming of three millions of men from bondage, and giving liberty to all who had a right to demand it; giving, I say, in the so-much censured words of this paper, giving "universal emancipation!" I speak in the spirit of the British law, which makes liberty commensurate with and inseparable from British soil; which proclaims even to the stranger and the sojourner, the moment he sets his foot upon British earth, that the ground on which he treads is holy, and consecrated by the genius of "universal emancipation!" No matter in what language his doom may have been pronounced; no matter what complexion, incompatible with freedom, an Indian or an African sun may have burnt upon him; no matter in what disastrous battle his liberty may have been cloven down; no matter with what solemnities he may have been devoted upon the altar of slavery; the first moment he touches the sacred soil of Britain, the altar and the god sink together in the dust; his soul walks abroad in her own majesty; his body swells beyond the measure of his chains, that burst from around him, and he stands redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled, by the irresistible genius of "universal emancipation."

HENRY GRATTAN.

1750-1820.

ON MOVING A DECLARATION OF IRISH RIGHT.*

I LAUGH at that man who supposes that Ireland will not be content with a free trade and a free constitution: and would any man advise her to be content with less?

I shall be told that we hazard the modification of the law of Poynings, and the Judges Bill, and the Habeas Corpus Bill, and the Nullum Tempus Bill; but, I ask, have you been for years begging for these little things, and have you not yet been able to obtain them? And have you been contending against a little body of eighty men, in privy council assembled, convoking themselves into the image of a Parliament, and ministering your high office; and have you been contending against one man, a humble individual, to you a leviathan—the English Attorney-General, exercising Irish legislation in his own person, and making your Parliamentary deliberations a blank, by altering your bills, or suppressing them: have you not been able to quell this little monster? Do you wish to know the reason? I will tell you; because you have not been a Parliament, nor your country a people. Do you wish to know the remedy? Be a Parliament, become a nation, and these things will follow in the train of your consequence.

I shall be told that titles are shaken, being vested by force of English Acts. But in answer to that I observe, time may be a title, but an English Act of Parliament certainly cannot. It is an authority which, if a judge would charge, no jury would find, and which all the electors of Ireland have already disclaimed—disclaimed unequivocally, cordially, and universally.

Sir, this is a good argument for an act of title, but no argument against a Declaration of Right. My friend, who sits above me, has a Bill of Confirmation.* We do not come unprepared to Parliament. I am not come to shake property, but to confirm property, and to restore freedom. The nation begins to form—we are moulding into a people; freedom asserted, property secured, and the army, a mercenary band, likely to be dependent on your Parliament, restrained by law. Never was such a revolution accomplished in so short a time, and with such public tranquillity. In what situation would those men, who call themselves friends of constitution and government, have left you? They would have left you without a title (as they stole it) to your estates, without an assertion of your constitution, or a law for your army; and this state of private and public insecurity, this anarchy, raging in the kingdom for eighteen months, these mock-moderators would have had the presumption to call peace.

The king has no other title to his crown than that which you have to your liberty. Both are founded, the throne and your freedom, upon the right vested in the subject to resist by arms, notwithstanding their oaths of allegiance, any authority attempting to impose acts of power as

* Part of a speech delivered in the Irish House of Commons, 19th April 1780, its object being to move the Irish Parliament to a Declaration of Right, which should deny the authority of England to make laws for Ireland.

* A bill to be immediately introduced on passing the Declaration, by which all laws of the English Parliament affecting property were to be confirmed by the Irish Parliament.

laws; whether that authority be one man or a host, the second James, or the British Parliament, every argument for the House of Hanover is equally an argument for the liberties of Ireland. The Act of Settlement* is an Act of rebellion, or the sixth of George I. an Act of usurpation. I do not refer to doubtful history, but to living record, to common charters, to the interpretation England has put on those charters (an interpretation made, not by words only, but crowned by arms), to the revolution she has formed upon them, to the king she has established, and, above all, to the oath of allegiance solemnly plighted to the House of Stuart, and afterwards set aside in the instance of a grave and moral people, absolved by virtue of those very charters: and as anything less than liberty is inadequate to Ireland, so is it dangerous to Great Britain. We are too near the British nation; we are too conversant with her history; we are too much fired by her example to be anything less than equals: anything less, we should be her bitterest enemies. An enemy to that power which smote us with her mace, and to that constitution from whose blessings we are excluded, to be ground, as we have been, by the British nation, bound by her Parliament, plundered by her Crown, threatened by her enemies, and insulted with her protection, while we return thanks for her condescension, in a system of meanness and misery, which has expired in our determination and in her magnanimity.

That there are precedents against us I allow; acts of power I would call them, not precedents; and I answer the English pleading such precedents, as they answered their kings when they urged precedents against the liberty of England. Such things are the tyranny of one side, the weakness of the other, and the law of neither. We will not be bound by them; or rather, in the words of the Declaration of Right, no doing, judgment, or proceeding to the contrary, shall be brought into precedent or example. Do not then tolerate a power, the power of the British Government, over this land, which has no foundation in necessity, or utility, or empire, or the laws of England, or the laws of Ireland, or the laws of nature, or the laws of God. Do not suffer that power which banished your manufactures, dishonoured your peerage, and stopped the growth of your people. Do not, I say, be bribed by an export of woollens, or an import of sugar, and suffer that power which has thus withered the land to have existence in your pusillanimity. Do not send the people to their own resolves for liberty, passing by the tribunals of justice, and the high court of Parliament; neither imagine that, by any formation of apology, you can palliate such a commission to your hearts, still less to your children, who will sting you in your grave for interfering between them and their Maker, and robbing them of an immense occasion, and losing an opportunity which you did not create, and can never restore.

Hereafter, when these things shall be history, your age of thraldom, your sudden resurrection, commercial redress, and miraculous armament,* shall the historian stop at *liberty*, and observe that here the principal men amongst us were found wanting, were awed by a weak ministry, bribed by an empty treasury; and, when liberty was within their grasp, and her temple opened its folding-doors, fell down, and were prostituted at the threshold.

I might, as a constituent, come to your bar and demand my liberty. I do call upon you by the laws of the land and their violation; by the instructions of eighteen counties, by the arms, inspiration, and providence of the present moment —tell us the rule by which we shall go; assert the law of Ireland; declare the liberty of the land! I will not be answered by a public lie, in the shape of an amendment; nor, speaking of the subjects' freedom, am I to hear of faction I wish for nothing but to breathe in this our island, in common with my fellow-subjects, the air of liberty. I have no ambition, unless it be to break your chain and contemplate your glory. I never will be satisfied so long as the meanest cottager in Ireland has a chain clanking to his rags. He may be naked, he shall not be in irons. And I do see the time at hand; the spirit is gone forth; the Declaration of Right is planted; and though great men should fall off, yet the cause shall live; and though he who utters this should die, yet the immortal fire shall outlast the humble organ who conveys it, and the breath of liberty, like the word of the holy man, will not die with the prophet, but survive him.

INVECTIVE AGAINST MR CORRY.†

At the emancipation of Ireland in 1782, I took a leading part in the foundation of that constitution which is now endeavoured to be destroyed. Of that constitution I was the author; in that constitution I glory; and for it the honourable gentleman should bestow praise, not invent calumny. Notwithstanding my weak state of body, I come to give my last testimony against this Union, so fatal to the liberties and interest of my country. I come to make common cause with these honourable and virtuous gentlemen around me, to try and save the constitution; or, if not save the constitution, at least to save our characters, and remove from our graves the

[a] An Act of the British Parliament settling the line of succession to the British Crown on the descendants of the Princess Sophia of Hanover, to the exclusion of the Stuarts.

* A reference to the rapid formation of the volunteer corps.

† Delivered in the Irish Parliament during the debate on the Union with England, February 14, 1800.

foul disgrace of standing apart while a deadly blow is aimed at the independence of our country. The right honourable gentleman says I fled from the country after inciting rebellion, and that I have returned to raise another. No such thing. The charge is false. The civil war had not commenced when I left the kingdom, and I could not have returned without taking a part. On the one side there was the camp of the rebel; on the other the camp of the minister, a greater traitor than that rebel. The stronghold of the constitution was nowhere to be found. I agree that the rebel who rose against the Government should have suffered; but I missed on the scaffold the right honourable gentleman. Two desperate parties were in arms against the constitution. The right honourable gentleman belonged to one of these parties, and deserved death. I could not join the rebel—I could not join the Government. I could not join torture—I could not join half-hanging—I could not join free quarter. I could take part with neither. I was therefore absent from a scene where I could not be active without self-reproach, not indifferent with safety.

Many honourable gentlemen thought differently from me. I respect their opinions, but I keep my own; and I think now, as I thought then, *that the treason of the minister against the liberties of the people was infinitely worse than the rebellion of the people against the minister.*

I have returned, not, as the right honourable member has said, to raise another storm—I have returned to discharge an honourable debt of gratitude to my country, that conferred a great reward for past services, which, I am proud to say, was not greater than my desert. I have returned to protect that constitution, of which I was the parent and the founder, from the assassination of such men as the honourable gentleman and his unworthy associates. They are corrupt—they are seditious—and they, at this very moment, are in a conspiracy against their country. I have returned to refute a libel, as false as it is malicious, given to the public under the appellation of a report of a committee of the House of Lords. Here I stand ready for impeachment or trial; I dare accusation; I defy the honourable gentleman; I defy the Government; I defy the whole phalanx. Let them come forth. I tell the ministers I will neither give them quarter nor take it. I am here to lay the shattered remains of my constitution on the floor of this House, in defence of the liberties of my country. . . .

My guilt or innocence has little to do with the question here. I rose with the rising fortunes of my country—I am willing to die with her expiring liberties. To the voice of the people I will bow, but never shall I submit to the calumnies of an individual hired to betray them and to slander me. The indisposition of my body has left me, perhaps, no means but that of lying down with falling Ireland, and recording upon her tomb my dying testimony against the flagitious corruption that has murdered her independence. The right honourable gentleman has said that this was not my place—that instead of having a voice in the councils of my country I should now stand a culprit at her bar—at the bar of a court of criminal judicature—to answer for my treasons. The Irish people have not so read my history, but let that pass; if I am what he said I am, the people are not therefore to forfeit their constitution. In point of argument, therefore, the attack is bad—in point of taste or feeling, if he had either, it is worse—in point of fact, it is false, utterly and absolutely false—as rancorous a falsehood as the most malignant motives could suggest to the prompt sympathy of a shameless and a venal defence. The right honourable gentleman has suggested examples which I should have shunned, and examples which I should have followed. I shall never follow his, and I have ever avoided it. I shall never be ambitious to purchase public scorn by private infamy—the lighter characters of the model have as little chance of weaning me from the habits of a life spent, if not exhausted, in the cause of my native land. Am I to renounce those habits now for ever, and at the beck of whom? I should rather say, of what?—half a minister—half a monkey—a 'prentice politician, and a master coxcomb! He has told you that what he has said of me here he would say anywhere. I believe he would say thus of me in any place where he thought himself safe in saying it. Nothing can limit his calumnies but his fear—in Parliament he has calumniated me to-night, in the King's Courts he would calumniate me to-morrow; but had he said or dared to insinuate one-half as much elsewhere, the indignant spirit of an honest man would have answered the vile and venal slanderer with—a blow

LORD ERSKINE.

1750-1823.

FROM A SPEECH IN BEHALF OF JOHN STOCKDALE, WHEN TRIED FOR A LIBEL ON THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.*

GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY,—If this be a wilfully false account of the instructions given to Mr Hastings for his government, and of his conduct under them, the author of this defence deserves the severest punishment for a mercenary imposition on the public. But if it be true that he was directed to make the *safety and prosperity of Bengal the first object of his attention*, and that, under his administration, it has been safe and prosperous; if it be true that the security and preservation of our possessions and revenues in Asia were marked out to him as the leading principle of his government, and that those possessions and revenues, amid unexampled dangers, have been secured and preserved; then a question may be unaccountably mixed with your consideration, much beyond the consequence of the present prosecution, involving, perhaps, the merit of the impeachment which gave it birth—a question which the Commons, as prosecutors of Mr Hastings, should, in common prudence, have avoided; unless, regretting the unwieldy length of their proceedings against him, they wish to afford him the opportunity of this strange anomalous defence. For, although I am neither his counsel, nor desire to have anything to do with his guilt or innocence, yet, in the collateral defence of my client, I am driven to state matter which may be considered by many as hostile to the impeachment. For if our dependencies have been secured, and their interests promoted, I am driven, in the defence of my client, to remark, that it is mad and preposterous to bring to the standard of justice and humanity the exercise of a dominion founded upon violence and terror. It may and must be true that Mr Hastings has repeatedly offended against the rights and privileges of Asiatic government, if he was the faithful deputy of a power which could not maintain itself for an hour without trampling upon both. He may and must have offended against the laws of God and nature, if he was the faithful viceroy of an empire, wrested in blood from the people to whom God and nature had given it. He may and must have preserved that unjust dominion over timorous and abject nations by a terrifying, overbearing, insulting superiority, if he was the faithful administrator of your Government, which, having no root in consent or affection—no foundation in similarity of interests—no support from any one principle which cements men together in society, could only be upheld by alternate stratagem and force. The unhappy people of India, feeble and effeminate as they are from the softness of their climate, and subdued and broken as they have been by the knavery and strength of civilisation, still occasionally start up in all the vigour and intelligence of insulted nature. To be governed at all, they must be governed with a rod of iron; and our empire in the East would, long since, have been lost to Great Britain, if civil skill and military prowess had not united their efforts to support an authority—which Heaven never gave—by means which it never can sanction.

Gentlemen, I think I can observe you are touched with this way of considering the subject, and I can account for it. I have not been considering it through the cold medium of books, but have been speaking of man and his nature, and of human dominion, from what I have seen of them myself among reluctant nations submitting to our authority. I know what they feel, and how such feelings can alone be repressed. I have heard them in my youth from a naked savage, in the indignant character of a prince, surrounded by his subjects, addressing the governor of a British colony, holding a bundle of sticks in his hand as the notes of his unlettered eloquence. "Who is it," said the jealous ruler over the desert, encroached on by the restless foot of English adventurer—"who is it that causes this river to rise in the high mountains, and to empty itself into the ocean? Who is it that causes to blow the loud winds of winter, and that calms them again in summer? Who is it that rears up the shade of those lofty forests, and blasts them with the quick lightning at His pleasure? The same being who gave to you a country on the other side of the waters, and gave ours to us; and by this title we will defend it," said the warrior, throwing down his tomahawk upon the ground, and raising the war-sound of his nation. These are the feelings of subjugated man all round the globe; and depend upon it, nothing but fear will control where it is vain to look for affection.

* Delivered before the Court of King's Bench, December 9, 1789.

FROM A SPEECH AGAINST THOMAS WILLIAMS FOR THE PUBLICATION OF PAINE'S "AGE OF REASON."*

I call for reverence to the Sacred Scriptures, not from their merits, unbounded as they are,

* Before Lord Kenyon and a special jury on the 24th of July 1797.

but from their authority in a Christian country; not from the obligations of conscience, but from the rules of law. For my own part, gentlemen, I have been ever deeply devoted to the truths of Christianity, and my firm belief in the Holy Gospel is by no means owing to the prejudices of education, though I was religiously educated by the best of parents, but arises from the fullest and most continued reflections of my riper years and understanding. It forms at this moment the great consolation of a life which, as a shadow, must pass away; and without it, indeed, I should consider my long course of health and prosperity, perhaps too long and uninterrupted to be good for any man, only as the dust which the wind scatters, and rather as a snare than as a blessing. Much, however, as I wish to support the authority of the Scriptures, from a reasoned consideration of them, I shall repress that subject for the present. But if the defence shall be, as I have suspected, to bring them at all into argument or question, I shall then fulfil a duty which I owe not only to the Court, as counsel for the prosecution, but to the public, to state what I feel and know concerning the evidence of that religion which is reviled without being examined, and denied without being understood.

I am well aware that, by the communications of a free press, all the errors of mankind, from age to age, have been dissipated and dispelled; and I recollect that the world, under the banners of reformed Christianity, has struggled through persecution to the noble eminence on which it stands at this moment, shedding the blessings of humanity and science upon the nations of the earth. It may be asked by what means the Reformation would have been effected, if the books of the Reformers had been suppressed, and the errors of condemned and exploded superstitious had been supported as unquestionable by the State, founded upon those very superstitions formerly, as it is at present upon the doctrines of the Established Church? or how, upon such principles, any reformation, civil or religious, can in future be effected? The solution is easy. Let us examine what are the genuine principles of the liberty of the press, as they regard writings upon general subjects, unconnected with the personal reputations of private men, which are wholly foreign to the present inquiry. They are full of simplicity, and are brought as near perfection by the law of England as, perhaps, is consistent with any of the frail institutions of mankind.

Although every community must establish supreme authorities, founded upon fixed principles, and must give high powers to magistrates to administer laws for the preservation of the government itself, and for the security of those who are to be protected by it; yet, as infallibility and perfection belong neither to human establishments, nor to human individuals, it ought to be the policy of all free establishments, as it is most peculiarly the principle of our own constitution to permit the most unbounded freedom of discussion, even by detecting errors in the constitution, or in the administration of the very Government itself, so as that decorum is observed which every State must exact from its subjects, and which imposes no restraint upon any intellectual composition, fairly, honestly, and decently addressed to the consciences and understandings of men. Upon this principle I have an unquestionable right—a right which the best subjects have exercised—to examine the principles and structure of the constitution, and by fair, manly reasoning, to question the practice of its administrators. I have a right to consider and point out errors in the one or in the other; and not merely to reason upon their existence, but to consider the means of their reformation. By such free, well-intentioned, modest, and dignified communication of sentiments and opinions, all nations have been gradually improved, and milder laws and purer religions have been established. The same principles which vindicate civil contentions, honestly directed, extend their protection to the sharpest controversies on religious faiths. This rational and legal course of improvement was recognised and ratified by Lord Kenyon as the law of England, in a late trial at Guildhall, when he looked back with gratitude to the labour of the Reformers, as the fountain of our religious emancipation, and of the civil blessings that followed in their train. The English constitution, indeed, does not stop short in the toleration of religious *opinions*, but liberally extends it to *practice*. It permits every man, even publicly to worship God according to his own conscience, though in marked dissent from the national establishment, so as he professes *the general faith*, which is the sanction of all our moral duties, and the only pledge of our submission to the system which constitutes a State. Is not this system of freedom of controversy, and freedom of worship, sufficient for all the purposes of human happiness and improvement? and will it be necessary for either that the law should hold out indemnity to those who wholly adjure and revile the Government of their country, or the religion on which it rests for its foundation?

I expect to hear, in answer to what I am now saying, much that will offend me. My learned friend, from the difficulties of his situation, which I know from experience how to feel for very sincerely, may be driven to advance propositions which it may be my duty, with much freedom, to reply to; and the law will sanction that freedom. But will not the ends of justice be completely answered by the right to point out the errors of his discourse, in terms that are decent and calculated to expose its defects? or will any argument suffer, or will public justice be impeded, because neither private honour and

justice, nor public decorum, would endure my telling my very learned friend that he was a fool, a liar, and a scoundrel, in the face of the Court, because I differed from him in argument or opinion? This is just the distinction between a book of free, legal controversy, and the book which I am arraigning before you. Every man has a legal right to investigate, with modesty and decency, controversial points of the Christian religion; but no man, consistently with a law which only exists under its sanctions, has a right not only broadly to deny its very existence, but to pour forth a shocking and insulting invective, which the lowest establishments in the gradations of civil authority ought not to be permitted to suffer, and which soon would be borne down by insolence and disobedience, if they did.

[Mr Erskine, after the statement of the principles of the liberty of the press, read and commented on several passages of Paine's "Age of Reason," selected in the indictment for the consideration and judgment of the jury. He then proceeded.]

GENTLEMEN,—It would be useless and disgusting to enumerate the other passages within the scope of the indictment. How any man can rationally vindicate the publication of such a book, in a country where the Christian religion is the very foundation of the law of the land, I am totally at a loss to conceive, and have no wish to discuss. How is a tribunal, whose whole jurisdiction is founded upon the solemn belief and practice of what is denied as falsehood and reprobated as impiety, to deal with such an anomalous defence? Upon what principle is it even offered to the Court, whose authority is contemned and mocked at? If the religion proposed to be called in question is not previously adopted in belief and solemnly acted upon, what authority has the Court to pass any judgment at all of acquittal or condemnation? Why am I now, or upon any other occasion, to submit to your lordship's authority. Why am I now, or at any time, to address twelve of my equals, as I am now addressing you, with reverence and submission? Under what sanction are the witnesses to give their evidence, without which there can be no trial? Under what obligations can I call upon you, the jury, representing your country, to administer justice? Surely upon no other than that you are sworn to administer it under the oaths you have taken. The whole judicial fabric, from the king's sovereign authority to the lowest office of magistracy, has no other foundation. The whole is built, both in form and substance, upon the same oath of every one of its ministers, to do justice "as God shall help them hereafter." What God? and what hereafter? That God, undoubtedly, who has commanded kings to rule, and judges to decree with justice; who has said to witnesses, not by the voice of nature, but in revealed commandments, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour;" and who has enforced obedience to them by the revelation of the unutterable blessings which shall attend their observances, and the awful punishments which shall await upon their transgressions.

But it seems this course of reason, and the time and the person are at last arrived, that are to dissipate the errors which have overspread the past generations of ignorance! The believers in Christianity are many, but it belongs to the few that are wise to correct their credulity! Belief is an act of reason; and superior reason may, therefore, dictate to the weak. In running the mind along the numerous list of sincere and devout Christians, I cannot help lamenting that Newton had not lived to this day, to have had his shallowness filled up with this new flood of light. But the subject is too awful for irony. I will speak plainly and directly. Newton was a Christian! Newton, whose mind burst forth from the fetters cast by nature upon our finite conceptions; Newton, whose science was truth, and the foundation of whose knowledge of it was philosophy:—Not those visionary and arrogant assumptions which too often usurp its name, but philosophy resting on the basis of mathematics, which, like figures, cannot lie:—Newton, who carried the line and rule to the utmost barriers of creation, and explored the principles by which, no doubt, all created matter is held together and exists. But this extraordinary man, in the mighty reach of his mind, overlooked, perhaps, the errors which a minuter investigation of the created things on this earth might have taught him of the essence of his Creator. What shall then be said of the great Mr Boyle, who looked into the organic structure of all matter, even to the brute inanimate substances which the foot treads on. Such a man may be supposed to have been equally qualified with Mr Paine to "look through nature, up to nature's God." Yet the result of all his contemplation was the most confirmed and devout belief in all which the other holds in contempt as despicable and drivelling superstition. But this error might, perhaps, arise from a want of due attention to the foundations of human judgment, and the structure of that understanding which God has given us for the investigation of truth. Let that question be answered by Mr Locke, who was, to the highest pitch of devotion and adoration, a Christian. Mr Locke, whose office was to detect the errors of thinking, by going up to the fountains of thought, and to divert into the proper track of reasoning the devious mind of man, by showing him its whole process, from the first perceptions of sense to the last conclusions of ratiocination; putting a rein, besides, upon false opinion, by practical rules for the conduct of human judgment.

But these men were only deep thinkers, and lived in their closets, unaccustomed to the traffic

of the world, and to the laws which practically regulate mankind. Gentlemen, in the place where you now sit to administer the justice of this great country, above a century ago Sir Matthew Hale presided, whose faith in Christianity is an exalted commentary upon its truth and reason, and whose life was a glorious example of its fruits in man; administering human justice with a wisdom and purity drawn from the pure fountain of the Christian dispensation, which has been, and will be in all ages, a subject of the highest reverence and admiration.

But it is said by Mr Paine that the Christian fable is but the tale of the more ancient superstition of the world, and may be easily detected by the proper understanding of the mythologies of the heathens. Did Milton understand these mythologies? Was he less versed than Mr Paine in the superstitions of the world? No; they were the subject of his immortal song; and though shut out from all recurrence to them, he poured them forth from the stores of a memory rich with all that man ever knew, and laid them in their order as the illustration of that real and exalted faith, the unquestionable source of that fervid genius which cast a sort of shade upon all the other works of man.

> "He passed the bounds of flaming space,
> Where angels tremble while they gaze;
> He saw, till, blasted with excess of light,
> He closed his eyes in endless night."

But it was the light of the body only that was extinguished, "the celestial light shone inward," and enabled him to "justify the ways of God to man." The result of his thinking was, nevertheless, not the same as Mr Paine's. The mysterious incarnation of our blessed Saviour, which the "Age of Reason" blasphemes in words so wholly unfit for the mouth of a Christian, or for the ear of a court of justice, that I dare not, and will not, give them utterance—Milton made the grand conclusion of "Paradise Lost," the rest of his finished labours, and the ultimate hope, expectation, and glory of the world:

> "*A virgin is his mother*, but His Sire,
> The power of the Most High; He shall ascend
> The throne hereditary, and bound His reign
> With earth's wide bounds, His glory with the heavens."

The immortal poet having thus put into the mouth of the angel the prophecy of man's redemption, follows it with the solemn and beautiful admonition, addressed in the poem to our great first parent, but intended as an address to his posterity throughout all generations:

> "This having learned, thou hast attained the sum
> Of wisdom; hope no higher, though all the stars
> Thou knewest by name, and all th' ethereal powers,
> All secrets of the deep, all Nature's works,
> Or works of God in heaven, air, earth, or sea,
> And all the riches of this world enjoy'st,
> And all the rule one empire: only add
> Deeds to thy knowledge answerable, add faith,
> Add virtue, patience, temperance; add love,
> By name to come called charity, the soul
> Of all the rest; then wilt thou not be loth
> To leave this Paradise, but shalt possess
> A paradise within thee, happier far."

Thus you find all that is great, or wise, or splendid, or illustrious, among created beings—all the minds gifted beyond ordinary nature, if not inspired by their universal author for the advancement and dignity of the world, though divided by distant ages, and by the clashing opinions distinguishing them from one another, yet joining, as it were, in one sublime chorus to celebrate the truths of Christianity, and laying upon its holy altars the never-failing offerings of their immortal wisdom.

RICHARD BRINSLEY SHERIDAN.

1751-1816.

ON SUMMING UP THE EVIDENCE ON THE SECOND OR BEGUM CHARGE AGAINST WARREN HASTINGS.*

["THOUGH Sheridan," says Mr W. F. Rae in his "Lives of Wilkes, Sheridan, and Fox," "soon took high rank among the good speakers and admirable debaters in the House of Commons, yet he was not classed among the greatest of English orators till after he had made his memorable speeches against Warren Hastings. The opportunity he then had for the display of his powers was almost unique. An impeachment of equal note had not been made since the time when the favourite minister of Charles I. was proceeded against for high crimes and misdemeanours, found guilty, and executed. Warren Hastings was one of the favourites of George III. In the opinion of his sovereign and his friends, he was the saviour of India; according to others, chief among whom was

* Delivered before the House of Lords, sitting as a High Court of Parliament, June 1788.

Edmund Burke, he was the greatest malefactor of the age. By one section of the community he was adored for having completed with unexampled brilliancy the great work begun by Lord Clive; another, and much smaller section, regarded him as one who merited the punishment ordinarily reserved for buccaneers and pirates.

"It is indisputable that Warren Hastings had been instrumental in extending the rule of this country over the East, and that to his vigour as a conqueror and an administrator the people of England owed the satisfaction of considering the acquisitions made in India ample compensation for the losses sustained in America. Moreover, his victories added largely to the national wealth. The rich spoils of the vanquished were distributed throughout England. That hundreds of families were the richer was due to him; the nation at large hailed him as a benefactor. To have annexed vast territories without adding to the national debt, to have rendered war the most lucrative of undertakings, to have distributed large dividends to the holders of East India stock while gaining glory for the English nation, seemed to most men feats as novel as they were gratifying, and deserving not only unstinted applause, but a princely recompense. Nor was the monarch on the throne, any more than the shouting mob in the street, too curious as to the precise moral character of the actions performed by Hastings. They were so entirely satisfied with the result as to be utterly indifferent to the means by which it had been attained.

"A few men, among whom Edmund Burke was the most earnest and the most conspicuous, thought otherwise. Not all the victories won by Clive, or all the acquisitions made by Hastings, dazzled him so as to blind his eyes to the treatment of those whom the conquerors had oppressed and ruined. He boldly stigmatised as freebooters and tyrants the men whom others regarded as heroes. . . .

"Next to Burke came Sheridan as an uncompromising supporter of the impeachment. He perceived that the occasion was an excellent one for the display of his special talents, and he laboured with unwonted diligence to play his part with splendour. Never were the toilsome preparations of the study better repaid by personal success in Parliament. William Pitt, his constant and uncomplimentary opponent; Burke, his countryman and rival; Fox, his acknowledged chief,—all concurred in pronouncing his speech advocating the impeachment of Warren Hastings to be the most marvellous piece of oratory they had ever heard in the House of Commons. More gratifying to his vanity, and still more unexpected, were the compliments paid him by the less notable members who had come prepared to vote against him, but who professed themselves ready to give him their support. The friends and defenders of Warren Hastings pleaded that they were unprepared at the moment with a suitable reply, and complained that, feeling themselves under a spell, they were powerless to refute accusations which, till stated by Sheridan, appeared to them alike baseless and unjust. It was unanimously resolved to adjourn the debate, in order that a division might be taken when the House was in a calmer and more impartial mood.

"After the trial had begun, Sheridan addressed the House of Lords, as one of the managers of the impeachment, on the same charge which had been the subject of his great speech in the House of Commons. The unprecedented success he had achieved on the first occasion made the second an ordeal of an unusually trying kind. To acquit himself as well a second time was to fall short of the expectations that had been raised. So greatly was the public curiosity excited, that fifty guineas were offered for a seat in Westminster Hall. He followed Burke, whose opening speech, wherein, in the name of the people of India, the Commons of England, and of human nature itself, he solemnly impeached Warren Hastings of high crimes and misdemeanours, was one of the most finished and impassioned ever delivered by that wonderful master of language, and ever heard by an English audience. Yet Sheridan successfully bore the double test of comparison with himself and with Burke, and for three successive days electrified his hearers. Without a tithe of Burke's profundity, and with no portion of his genius, he was better able to influence an audience, and excite their admiration, for, in addition to being an impressive orator, he was also a consummate actor. A contemporary who heard this speech, and who was a declared opponent of the speaker, records that 'the most ardent admirers of Burke, of Fox, and of Pitt, allowed that they had been outdone as orators by Sheridan.'"]

MY LORDS,—I shall not waste your Lordships' time nor my own by any preliminary observations on the importance of the subject before you, or on the propriety of our bringing it in this solemn manner to a final decision. My honourable friend [Mr Burke], the principal mover of the impeachment, has already executed the task in a way the most masterly and impressive. He, whose indignant and enterprising genius, roused by the calls of public justice, has, with unprecedented labour, perseverance, and eloquence, excited one branch of the legislature to the vindication of our national character, and through whose means the House of Commons now makes this embodied stand in favour of man against man's iniquity, need hardly be followed on the *general* grounds of the prosecution.

Confiding in the dignity, the liberality, and intelligence of the tribunal before which I now

have the honour to appear in my delegated capacity of a manager, I do not, indeed, conceive it necessary to engage your Lordships' attention for a single moment with any introductory animadversions. But there is one point which here presents itself that it becomes me not to overlook. Insinuations have been thrown out that my honourable colleagues and myself are actuated by motives of malignity against the unfortunate prisoner at the bar. An imputation of so serious a nature cannot be permitted to pass altogether without comment; though it comes in so loose a shape, in such whispers and oblique hints as to prove to a certainty that it was made in the consciousness, and, therefore, with the circumspection of falsehood.

I can, my Lords, most confidently aver, that a prosecution more disinterested in all its motives and ends; more free from personal malice or personal interest; more perfectly public, and more purely animated by the simple and unmixed spirit of justice, never was brought in any country, at any time, by any body of men, against any individual. What possible resentment can we entertain against the unfortunate prisoner? What possible interest can we have in his conviction? What possible object of a personal nature can we accomplish by his ruin? For myself, my Lords, I make this solemn asseveration, that I discharge my breast of all malice, hatred, and ill-will against the prisoner, if at any time indignation at his crimes has planted in it these passions; and I believe, my Lords, that I may with equal truth answer for every one of my colleagues.

We are, my Lords, anxious, in stating the crimes with which he is charged, to keep out of recollection the person of the unfortunate prisoner. In prosecuting him to conviction, we are impelled only by a sincere abhorrence of his guilt, and a sanguine hope of remedying future delinquency. We can have no private incentive to the part we have taken. We are actuated singly by the zeal we feel for the public welfare, and by an honest solicitude for the honour of our country, and the happiness of those who are under its dominion and protection.

With such views, we really, my Lords, lose sight of Mr Hastings, who, however great in some other respects, is too insignificant to be blended with these important circumstances. The unfortunate prisoner is, at best, to my mind, no mighty object. Amid the series of mischiefs and enormities to *my sense* seeming to surround him, what is he but a petty nucleus, involved in its *laminæ*, scarcely seen or heard of?

This prosecution, my Lords, was not, as is alleged, "begot in prejudice, and nursed in error." It originated in the clearest conviction of the wrongs which the natives of Hindostan have endured by the maladministration of those in whose hands this country had placed extensive powers; which ought to have been exercised for the benefit of the governed, but which was used by the prisoner for the shameful purpose of oppression. I repeat with emphasis, my Lords, that nothing personal or malicious has induced us to institute this prosecution. It is absurd to suppose it. We come to your Lordships' bar as the representatives of the Commons of England; and, as acting in this public capacity, it might as truly be said that the Commons, in whose name the impeachment is brought before your Lordships, were actuated by enmity to the prisoner, as that we, their deputed organs, have any private spleen to gratify in discharging the duty imposed upon us by our principals.

Your Lordships will also recollect and discriminate between impeachment for *capital* offences and impeachment for high crimes and misdemeanours. In an impeachment of the former kind, when the life of an individual is to be forfeited on conviction, if malignity be indulged in giving a strong tincture and colouring to facts, the tenderness of man's nature will revolt at it; for, however strongly indignant we may be at the perpetration of offences of a gross quality, there is a feeling that will protect an accused person from the influence of malignity in such a situation; but where no traces of this malice are discoverable, where no thirst for blood is seen, where, seeking for exemplary more than sanguinary justice, an impeachment is brought for high crimes and misdemeanours, malice will not be imputed to the prosecutors if, in illustration of the crimes alleged, they should adduce every possible circumstance in support of their allegations. Why will it not? Because their ends have nothing abhorrent to human tenderness. Because, in such a case as the present, for instance, all that is aimed at in convicting the prisoner is a temporary seclusion from the society of his countrymen, whose name he has tarnished by his crimes, and a deduction from the enormous spoils which he has accumulated by his greedy rapacity.

I. The only matter which I shall, in this stage of my inquiry, lay before your Lordships, in order to give you an impression of the influence of the crimes of the prisoner over the country in which they were committed, is to refer to some passages in a letter of the Earl of Cornwallis.

You see, my Lords, that the British government, which ought to have been a blessing to the powers in India connected with it, has proved a scourge to the natives, and the cause of desolation to their most flourishing provinces.

Behold, my Lords, this frightful picture of the consequences of a government of violence and oppression! Surely the condition of wretchedness to which this once happy and independent prince is reduced by our cruelty, and the ruin which in some way has been brought upon his

country, call loudly upon your Lordships to interpose, and to rescue the national honour and reputation from the infamy to which both will be exposed, if no investigation be made into the causes of their calamities, and no punishment inflicted on the authors of them. By policy as well as justice, you are vehemently urged to vindicate the English character in the East; for, my Lords, it is manifest that the native powers have so little reliance on our faith, that the preservation of our possessions in that division of the world can only be effected by convincing the princes that a religious adherence to its engagements with them shall hereafter distinguish our India government.

To these letters what answer shall we return? Let it not, my Lords, be by words, which will not find credit with the natives, who have been so often deceived by our professions, but by deeds which will assure them that we are at length truly in earnest. It is only by punishing those who have been guilty of the delinquencies which have ruined the country, and by showing that future criminals will not be encouraged or countenanced by the ruling powers at home, that we can possibly gain confidence with the people of India. This alone will revive their respect for us, and secure our authority over them. This alone will restore to us the alienated attachment of the much-injured nabob, silence his clamours, heal his grievances, and remove his distrust. This alone will make him feel that he may cherish his people, cultivate his lands, and extend the mild hand of parental care over a fertile and industrious kingdom, without dreading that prosperity will entail upon him new rapine and extortion. This alone will inspire the nabob with confidence in the English government, and the subjects of Oude with confidence in the nabob. This alone will give to the soil of that delightful country the advantages which it derived from a beneficent Providence, and make it again what it was when invaded by an English spoiler, the garden of India.

It is in the hope, my Lords, of accomplishing these salutary ends, of restoring character to England and happiness to India, that we have come to the bar of this exalted tribunal.

In looking round for an object fit to be held out to an oppressed people, and to the world as an example of national justice, we are forced to fix our eyes on Mr Hastings. It is he, my Lords, who has degraded our fame, and blasted our fortunes in the East. It is he who has tyrannised with relentless severity over the devoted natives of those regions. It is he who must atone, as a victim, for the multiplied calamities he has produced!

But though, my Lords, I designate the prisoner as a proper subject of exemplary punishment, let it not be presumed that I wish to turn the sword of justice against him merely because some example is required. Such a wish is as remote from my heart as it is from equity and law. Were I not persuaded that it is impossible I should fail to render the evidence of his crimes as conclusive as the effects of his conduct are confessedly afflicting, I should blush at having selected him as an object of retributive justice. If I invoke this heavy penalty on Mr Hastings, it is because I honestly believe him to be a flagitious delinquent, and by far the most so of all those who have contributed to ruin the natives of India and disgrace the inhabitants of Britain. But while I call for justice upon the prisoner, I sincerely desire to render him justice. It would indeed distress me, could I imagine that the weight and consequence of the House of Commons, who are a party in this prosecution, could operate in the slightest degree to his prejudice; but I entertain no such solicitude or apprehension. It is the glory of the constitution under which we live, that no man can be punished without guilt, and this guilt must be publicly demonstrated by a series of clear, legal, manifest evidence, so that nothing dark, nothing oblique, nothing authoritative, nothing insidious, shall work to the detriment of the subject. It is not the peering suspicion of apprehended guilt. It is not any popular abhorrence of its wide-spread consequences. It is not the secret consciousness in the bosom of the judge which can excite the vengeance of the law, and authorise its infliction! No! In this good land, as high as it is happy, because as just as it is free, all is definite, equitable, and exact. The laws must be satisfied before they are incurred; and ere a hair of the head can be plucked to the ground, *legal guilt* must be established by *legal proof*.

But this cautious, circumspect, and guarded principle of English jurisprudence, which we all so much value and revere, I feel at present in some degree inconvenient, as it may prove an impediment to public justice; for the managers of this impeachment labour under difficulties with regard to evidence that can scarcely occur in any other prosecution. What! my Lords, it may perhaps be asked, have none of the considerable persons who are sufferers by his crimes arrived to offer at your Lordships' bar their testimony, mixed with their execrations against the prisoner? No—there are none. These sufferers are persons whose manners and prejudices keep them separate from all the world, and whose religion will not admit them to appear before your Lordships. But are there no witnesses, unprejudiced spectators of these enormities, ready to come forward, from the simple love of justice, and to give a faithful narrative of the transactions that passed under their eyes? No—there are none. The witnesses whom we have been compelled to summon are, for the most part, the emissaries and agents employed, and involved in these transactions; the wily accom-

plices of the prisoner's guilt, and the supple instruments of his oppressions. But are there collected no written documents or authentic papers, containing a true and perfect account of his crimes? No—there are none. The only papers we have procured are written by the party himself, or the participators in his proceedings, who studied, as it was their interest, though contrary to their duty, to conceal the criminality of their conduct, and, consequently, to disguise the truth.

But though, my Lords, I dwell on the difficulties which the managers have to encounter with respect to the evidence in this impeachment, I do not solicit indulgence, or even mean to hint, that what we have adduced is in any material degree defective. Weak no doubt it is in some parts, and deplorable, as undistinguished by any compunctious visitings of repenting accomplices. But there is enough, and enough in sure validity, notwithstanding every disadvantage and impediment, to abash the front of guilt no longer hid, and to flash those convictions on the minds of your Lordships, which should be produced.

II. I now proceed, my Lords, to review the evidence.

(1.) The first article which I shall notice must, I think, be considered pretty strong. It is the defence, or rather the *defences*, of the prisoner before the House of Commons; for he has already made four: three of which he has since abandoned and endeavoured to discredit. I believe it is a novelty in the history of criminal jurisprudence, that a person accused should first set up a defence, and afterward strive to invalidate it. But this, certainly, has been the course adopted by the prisoner; and I am the more surprised at it, as he has had the full benefit of the ablest counsel. Rescued from his own devious guidance, I could hardly have imagined that he would have acted so unwisely or indecently, as to evince his contempt of one House of Parliament by confessing the impositions which he had practised on the other. But by this extraordinary proceeding, he has given, unwarily, to your Lordships a pledge of his *past* ~~truth~~, in the *acknowledged falsehood* of his present conduct.

In every court of law in England, the confession of a criminal, when not obtained by any promise of favour or lenity, or by violent threats, is always admitted as conclusive evidence against himself. And if such confession were made before a grave and respectable assembly of persons competent to take cognisance of crimes, there is no doubt but that it would have due weight, because it is fair to presume that it must be voluntary, and not procured by any undue or improper means. The prisoner has, in his defence, *admitted many facts;* and it is the intention of the managers, accordingly, to urge in support of the charges his admission of them. For, when he did it, he was speaking the language not of inconsiderate rashness and haste, but of deliberate consideration and reflection, as will appear to your Lordships by a passage which I shall cite from the introduction to the defence read by Mr Hastings himself at the bar of the House of Commons. He employs the following words: "Of the discouragement to which I allude, I shall mention but two points, and these it is incumbent upon me to mention, because they relate to effects which the justice of this honourable House may, and I trust will, avert. The first is an obligation to my being at all committed in my defence; since, in so wide a field for discussion, it would be impossible not to admit some things of which an advantage might be taken to turn them into evidence against myself, whereas *another* might as well use as I could, or better, the same materials of my defence, without involving me in the same consequences. But I am sure the honourable House will yield me its protection against the cavils of unwarranted inference, and if truth can tend to convict me, I am content to be myself the channel to convey it. The other objection lies in my own breast. It was not till Monday last that I formed the resolution, and I knew not then whether I might not, in consequence, be laid under the obligation of preparing and completing in five days (and in effect so it proved) the refutation of charges which it has been the labour of my accuser, armed with all the powers of Parliament, to compile during as many years of almost undisturbed leisure."

Here, then, my Lords, the prisoner has, upon deliberation, committed his defence to paper; and after having five days to consider whether he should present it or not, he actually delivers it himself to the House of Commons as one founded in truth, and triumphantly remarks, that "if truth could tend to convict him, he was willing to be himself the channel to convey it."

But what is his language *now* that he has the advice of counsel? Why, that there is not a word of truth in what he delivered to the House of Commons *as* truth! He did not, it seems, himself prepare the defence which he read as his own before that body. He employed others to draw it up. Major Scott comes to your bar, and represents Mr Hastings, as it were, *contracting* for a character, to be made ready to his hands. Knowing, no doubt, that the accusation of the Commons had been drawn up by a committee, he thought it necessary, as a point of punctilio, to answer it by a committee also. For himself, he had no knowledge of the facts! no recollection of the circumstances! He commits his defence wholly to his friends! He puts his memory in trust, and duly nominates and appoints commissioners to take charge of it! One furnishes the raw material of fact, the second spins the argument, and the third twines up the conclusion; while Mr Hastings, with a

master's eye, is cheering them on, and overlooking the loom. To Major Scott he says, "You have my *good faith* in your hands—take care of my *consistency*—manage my *veracity* to the best advantage!" "Mr Middleton, you have my *memory* in commission!" "Mr Shore, make me out a good *financier!*" "Remember, Mr Impey, you have my *humanity* in your hands!" When this product of their skill was done, he brings it to the House of Commons, and says, "I was equal to the task. I knew the difficulties, but I scorned them: here is the *truth*, and if the truth tends to convict me, I am content myself to be the channel of it." His friends hold up their heads and say, "What noble magnanimity! This *must* be the effect of real innocence!"

But this journeyman's work, after all, is found to be defective. It is good enough for the House of Commons, but not for your Lordships. The prisoner now presents himself at your bar, and his only apprehension seems to arise from what had been thus done for him. He exclaims, "I am careless of what the managers say or do. Some of them have high passions, and others have bitter words, but these I heed not. Save me from the peril of my own panegyric; snatch me from my own friends. Do not believe a syllable of what I said before! I cannot submit now to be tried, as I imprudently challenged, by the account which I have myself given of my own transactions!" Such is the language of the prisoner, by which it appears that truth is not natural to him, but that falsehood comes at his beck. Truth, indeed, it is said, lies deep, and requires time and labour to gain; but falsehood swims on the surface, and is always at hand.

It is in this way, my Lords, that the prisoner shows you how he sports with the dignity and feelings of the House by asserting that to be false and not entitled to credit this day, which, on a former, he had averred to be truth itself. Indeed, from this avowal and disavowal of defences, and from the present defence differing from all the former which have been delivered to your Lordships, it does seem that Mr Hastings thinks he may pursue this course just as far as best suits his convenience or advantage. It is not at all improbable, if he should deem it expedient, that he will hereafter abandon the one now submitted to you, and excuse himself by saying, "It was not made by me, but by my counsel, and I hope, therefore, your Lordships will give no credit to it." But if he will abide by this, his last revised and amended defence, I will join issue with him upon it, and prove it to be in numerous places void of truth, and almost every part of it unfounded in argument as well as fact.

(2.) I am now to advert more particularly to the evidence in support of the allegations of the charge on which the prisoner is arraigned. We have already shown, most satisfactorily, that the Begums of Oude were of high birth and distinguished rank; the elder, or grandmother of the reigning prince, being the daughter of a person of ancient and illustrious lineage, and the younger, or prince's mother, of descent scarcely less noble. We have also shown, with equal clearness, by the testimony of several witnesses, how sacred is the residence of women in India. To menace, therefore, the dwelling of these princesses with violation, as the prisoner did, was a species of torture, the cruelty of which can only be conceived by those who are conversant with the peculiar customs and notions of the inhabitants of Hindostan.

We have nothing in Europe, my Lords, which can give us an idea of the manners of the East. Your Lordships cannot even learn the right nature of the people's feelings and prejudices from any history of other Mohammedan countries—not even from that of the Turks, for *they* are a mean and degraded race in comparison with many of these great families, who, inheriting from their Persian ancestors, preserve a purer style of prejudice and a loftier superstition. Women there are not as in Turkey—they neither go to the mosque nor to the bath. It is not the thin veil alone that hides them, but, in the inmost recesses of their zenana, they are kept from public view by those reverenced and protected walls, which, as Mr Hastings and Sir Elijah Impey admit, are held sacred even by the ruffian hand of warfare, or the more uncourteous hand of the law. But, in this situation, they are not confined from a mean and selfish policy of man, or from a coarse and sensual jealousy. Enshrined, rather than immured, their habitation and retreat is a sanctuary, not a prison—their jealousy is their own—a jealousy of their own honour, that leads them to regard liberty as a degradation, and the gaze of even admiring eyes as inexpiable pollution to the purity of their fame and the sanctity of their honour

Such being the general opinion (or prejudices, let them be called) of this country, your Lordships will find that whatever treasures were given or lodged in a zenana of this description must, upon the evidence of the thing itself, be placed beyond the reach of resumption. To dispute with the counsel about the original right to those treasures—to talk of a title to them by the Mohammedan law! Their title to them is the title of a saint to the relics upon an altar, placed there by piety, guarded by holy superstition, and to be snatched from thence only by sacrilege.

What, now, my Lords, do you think of the tyranny and savage apathy of a man who could act in open defiance of those prejudices which are so interwoven with the very existence of the females of the East, that they can be removed only by death? What do your Lordships think of the atrocity of a man who could threaten to

profane and violate the sanctuary of the Princesses of Oude, by declaring that he would storm it with his troops, and expel the inhabitants from it by force? There is, my Lords, displayed in the whole of this black transaction a wantonness of cruelty and ruffian-like ferocity that, happily, are not often incident even to the most depraved and obdurate of our species.

Had there been in the composition of the prisoner's heart one generous propensity, or lenient disposition even slumbering and torpid, it must have been awakened and animated into kindness and mercy toward these singularly interesting females. Their character, and situation at the time, presented every circumstance to disarm hostility, and to kindle the glow of manly sympathy; but no tender impression could be made on his soul, which is as hard as adamant, and as black as sin. Stable as the everlasting hills in its schemes and purposes of villainy, it has never once been shaken by the cries of affliction, the claims of charity, or the complaints of injustice. With steady and undeviating step he marches on to the consummation of the abominable projects of wickedness which are engendered and contrived in its gloomy recesses. What his soul prepares, his hands are ever ready to execute.

It is true, my Lords, that the prisoner is conspicuously gifted with the energy of vice, and the firmness of indurated sensibility. These are the qualities which he assiduously cultivates, and of which his friends vauntingly exult. They have, indeed, procured him his triumphs and his glories. Truly, my lords, they have spread his fame, and erected the sombre pyramids of his renown.

That the treasures, my Lords, of the zenana, the object of the prisoner's rapacity, and the incentive to his sacrilegious violation of this hallowed abode of the Princesses of Oude, were their *private property*, justly acquired and legally secured, and not the *money of the state*, as is alleged, has been clearly and incontestably demonstrated. It must be recollected how conclusive was the testimony, both positive and circumstantial, which we brought to support this point. Believing that it must have pressed itself upon your memories, I shall avoid here the tediousness of a detailed recapitulation. Permit me, however, to call your attention to a very brief summary of it.

It is in complete evidence before you that Sujah ul Dowlah, the husband of the elder [younger] begum, entertained the warmest affection for his wife, and the liveliest solicitude for her happiness. Endeared to him by the double ties of conjugal attachment, and the grateful remembrance of her exemplary conduct toward him in the season of his severest misfortunes and accumulated distress, he seems, indeed, to have viewed her with an extravagance of fondness bordering on enthusiasm. You know, my Lords, that when the nabob [Sujah Dowlah] was reduced, by the disastrous defeat which he sustained at Buxar, to the utmost extremity of adverse fortune, she, regardless of the danger and difficulties of the enterprise, fled to him, for the purpose of administering to his misery the solace of tenderness; and, prompted by the noblest sentiment, took along with her, for his relief, the jewels with which he had enriched her in his happier and more prosperous days. By the sale of these he raised a large sum of money, and retrieved his fortunes. After this generous and truly exemplary conduct on her part, the devotion of the husband to the wife knew no bounds. Can any further proof be required of it than the appointment of his son, by her [Asoph Dowlah, the reigning nabob], as the successor to his throne? With these dispositions, then, toward his wife, and from the manifest ascendancy which she had acquired over him, is it, my Lords, I ask, an unwarrantable presumption that he did devise to her the treasures which she claimed? On the question of the legal right which the nabob had to make such a bequest I shall not now dwell; it having been already shown, beyond disputation, by the learned manager [Mr Adam] who opened the charge, that, according to the theory as well as the practice of the Mohammedan law, the reigning prince *may* alienate and dispose of either real or personal property. And it further appears, my Lords, from the testimony which has been laid before you, that the younger begum, or the nabob's [Asoph Dowlah] mother, lent money to her son, amounting to twenty-six lacs of rupees, for which she received, as a pledge, his bonds. Here is the *evidentia rei* that the money so lent was acknowledged to be hers; for no one borrows his own money and binds himself to repay it!

But, my Lords, let us look into the origin of this pretended claim to the begum's treasures. We hear nothing of it till the nabob [Asoph] became embarrassed by the enormous expense of maintaining the military establishments to which he was compelled by the prisoner. Then, as a *dernier ressort*, the title to the treasures was set up, as the property of the Crown, which could not be willed away. This, truly, was the dawn of the claim. Not long afterward, we detect the open interference of Mr Hastings in this fraudulent transaction. It was, indeed, hardly to be expected that he would permit so favourable an occasion to escape of indulging his greedy rapacity. We find, accordingly, that Mr Bristow, the resident at the court of Lucknow [the capital of Oude], duly received instructions to support, with all possible dexterity and intrigue, the pretensions of the nabob. The result of the negotiation which in consequence took place, was, that the mother, as well to relieve the distresses of her son as to secure a *portion* of her property, agreed finally to cancel his bond for the twenty-six lacs of rupees already lent,

and to pay him thirty additional lacs, or £300,000, making in the whole £560,000 sterling. Part of this sum it was stipulated should be paid in goods contained in the zenana, which, as they consisted of arms and other implements of war, the nabob alleged to be the property of the state, and refused to receive in payment. The point, however, being referred to the Board at Calcutta, Mr Hastings then, it is important to remark, *vindicated* the right of the begums to all the goods of the zenana, and brought over a majority of the council to his opinion. The matter in dispute being thus adjusted, a treaty between the mother and son was formally entered into, and to which the English became parties, guaranteeing its faithful execution. In consideration of the money paid to him by the mother, the son agreed to release all claim to the landed and remaining parts of the personal estate left by his father, Sujah ul Dowlah, to the princess his widow. Whatever, therefore, might have been her title to this property before, her right, under this treaty and the guarantee, became as legal, as strong, and obligatory, as the laws of India, and the laws of nations, could possibly make it.

But, my Lords, notwithstanding the opinion which Mr Hastings so strenuously supported in the council at Calcutta of the absolute right of the princess to all the property in the zenana, yet when it became convenient to his nefarious purposes to disown it, he, with an effrontery which has no example, declared that this recorded decision belonged not to him, but to the majority of the council! That, in short, being reduced to an inefficient minority in the council, he did not consider himself as responsible for any of their acts, either of those he opposed or those he approved. My Lords, you are well acquainted with the nature of majorities and minorities; but how shall I instance this new doctrine? It is as if Mr Burke, the great leader of this prosecution, should, some ten years hence, revile the managers, and commend Mr Hastings! "What, sir!" might one of us exclaim to him, "do you, who instigated the inquiry, who brought the charge against him, who impeached him, who convinced me, by your arguments, of his guilt, speak of Mr Hastings in this plausive style?" "Oh! but sir," replies Mr Burke, "this was done in the House of Commons, where, at the time, I was one of an inefficient minority, and, consequently, I am not responsible for any measure, either those I opposed or approved."

If, my Lords, at any future period, my honourable friend should become so lost to truth, to honour, and consistency, as to speak in this manner, what must be the public estimation of his character? Just such was the conduct of the prisoner in avowing that he did not consider himself responsible for the measures which he approved while controlled in the council by General Clavering, Colonel Monson, and Mr Francis, the only halcyon season that India saw during his administration.

But, my Lords, let it be observed that the claims of the nabob to the treasures of the begums were, at this time, the only plea alleged for the seizure. These were founded on a passage of the Koran, which is perpetually quoted, but never proved. Not a word was then mentioned of the strange rebellion which was afterward conjured up, and of which the existence and the notoriety were equally a secret! a disaffection which was at its height at the very moment when the begums were dispensing their liberality to the nabob, and exercising the greatest generosity to the English in distress! a disturbance without its parallel in history, which was raised by two *women*, carried on by *eunuchs*, and finally suppressed by an *affidavit!*

No one, my Lords, can contemplate the seizure of this treasure, with the attendant circumstances of aggravation, without being struck with horror at the complicated wickedness of the transaction. We have already seen the noblest heroism and magnanimity displayed by the mother begum. It was she, my Lords, you will recollect, who extricated, by the most generous interposition, her husband, Sujah Dowlah, from the rigours of his fortune after the fatal battle of Buxar. She even saved her son, the reigning nabob, from death, at the imminent hazard of her own life. She also, as you know, gave to her son his throne. A son so preserved, and so befriended, Mr Hastings did arm against his benefactress, and his mother. He invaded the rights of that prince, that he might compel him to violate the laws of nature and the obligations of gratitude, by plundering his parent. Yes, my Lords, it was the prisoner who cruelly instigated the son against the mother. That mother, who had twice given life to her son, who had added to it a throne, was (incredible as it may appear), by the compulsion of that man at your bar, to whose guardianship she was bequeathed by a dying husband—by that man, who is wholly insensible to every obligation which sets bounds to his rapacity and his oppression, was she pillaged and undone! But the son was not without his excuse. In the moment of anguish, when bewailing his hapless condition, he exclaimed that it was the English who had driven him to the perpetration of such enormities. "It is they who have reduced me. They have converted me to their use. They have made me a slave, to compel me to become a monster."

Let us now, my Lords, turn to the negotiations of Mr Middleton with the begums in 1778, when the "discontents of the superior begum would have induced her to leave the country, unless her authority was sanctioned and her property secured by the guarantee of the Company.' This guarantee the counsel of Mr Hastings have thought it necessary to deny; knowing that if the agreements with the elder begum were

proved, it would affix to their client the guilt of all the sufferings of the women of the khord mahal [dwelling of the female relatives of the nabob], the revenues for whose support were secured by the same engagement. In treating this part of the subject, the principal difficulty arises from the uncertain evidence of Mr Middleton, who, though concerned in the negotiation of four treaties, could not recollect affixing his signature to *three* out of that number! It can, however, be shown, even by his evidence, that a treaty was signed in October 1778, wherein the rights of the elder begum were fully recognised; a provision secured for the women and children of the late vizier in the khord mahal; and that these engagements received the fullest sanction of Mr Hastings. These facts are, moreover, confirmed by the evidence of Mr Purling, a gentleman who delivered himself fairly, and as having no foul secrets to conceal. Mr Purling swears he transmitted copies of these engagements, in 1780, to Mr Hastings at Calcutta; the answer returned was "that, in arranging the taxes of the other districts, he should pass over the *jaghires* of the begums." No notice was then taken of any impropriety in the transactions in 1778, nor any notice given of an intended revocation of those engagements.

In June 1781, however, when General Clavering and Colonel Monson were no more, and Mr Francis had returned to Europe, all the *hoard* and *arrear* of collected evil burst out without restraint, and Mr Hastings determined on his journey to the upper provinces. It was then that, without adverting to intermediate transactions, he met with the Nabob Asoph Dowlah at Chunar, and received from him the mysterious present of £100,000. To form a proper idea of this transaction, it is only necessary to consider the respective situations of him who gave and of him who received this present. It was not given by the nabob from the superflux of his wealth, nor in the abundance of his esteem for the man to whom it was presented. It was, on the contrary, a prodigal bounty, drawn from a country depopulated by the natural progress of British rapacity. It was after the country had felt still other calamities—it was after the angry dispensations of Providence had, with a progressive severity of chastisement, visited the land with a famine one year, and with a Colonel Hanney the next—it was after he, this Hanney, had returned to retrace the steps of his former ravages—it was after he and his voracious crew had come to plunder ruins which himself had made, and to glean from desolation the little that famine had spared, or rapine overlooked; *then* it was that this miserable bankrupt prince, marching through his country, besieged by the clamours of his starving subjects, who cried to him for protection through their cages—meeting the curses of some of his subjects, and the prayers of others—with famine at his heels, and reproach following him—then it was that this prince is represented as exercising this act of prodigal bounty to the very man whom he here reproaches—to the very man whose policy had extinguished his power, and whose creatures had desolated his country. To talk of a free-will gift! It is audacious and ridiculous to name the supposition. It was not a free-will gift. What was it, then? Was it a bribe? Or was it extortion? I shall prove it was both—it was an act of gross bribery and of rank extortion. The *secrecy* which marked this transaction is not the smallest proof of its criminality. When Benarum Pundit had, a short time before, made a present to the Company of a lac of rupees, Mr Hastings, in his own language, deemed it "worthy the praise of being recorded." But in this instance, when ten times that sum was given, neither Mr Middleton nor the council were acquainted with the transaction, until Mr Hastings, four months afterward, felt himself compelled to write an account of it to England; and the intelligence returned thus circuitously to his friends in India! It is peculiarly observable in this transaction, how much the *distresses* of the different parties were at variance. The first thing Mr Hastings does is to leave Calcutta in order to go to the relief of the distressed nabob. The second thing is to take £100,000 *from* that distressed nabob, on account of the distressed Company. The third thing is, to ask of the distressed Company this very same £100,000 on account of the distresses of Mr Hastings! There never were three distresses that seemed so little reconcilable with one another. This money, the prisoner alleges, was appropriated to the payment of the army. But here he is unguardedly contradicted by the testimony of his friend, Major Scott, who shows it was employed for no such purpose. My Lords, through all these windings of mysterious hypocrisy, and of artificial concealment, is it not easy to discern the sense of hidden guilt?*

III. Driven from every other hold, the prisoner is obliged to resort, as a justification of his enormities, to the stale pretext of State Necessity! Of this last disguise it is my duty to strip him. I will venture to say, my Lords, that no one instance of real necessity can be adduced. The necessity which the prisoner alleges listens to whispers for the purpose of

* "The nabob," says Mr Mill, "was totally unprovided with the money; the gift could be tendered only in bills, which were drawn on one of the great bankers of the country. As the intention of concealing the transaction should not be imputed to Mr Hastings unless as far as evidence appears, so in this case the disclosure cannot be imputed as a virtue, since no prudent man would have risked the chance of discovery which the publicity of a banker's transactions implied. Mr Hastings informed the directors of what he had received, in a letter dated January 20, 1782, and in very plain terms requested their permission to make the money his own."—*Mill's British India*, iv. 409.

crimination, and deals in rumour to prove its own existence. *His* a State Necessity! No, my Lords, that imperial tyrant, *State Necessity*, is yet a generous despot—bold in his demeanour, rapid in his decisions, though terrible in his grasp. What he does, my Lords, he dares avow; and avowing, scorns any other justification than the high motives that placed the iron sceptre in his hand. Even where its rigours are suffered, its apology is also known; and men learn to consider it in its true light, as a power which turns occasionally aside from just government, when its exercise is calculated to prevent greater evils than it occasions. But a quibbling, prevaricating necessity, which tries to steal a pitiful justification from whispered accusations and fabricated rumours—no, my Lords, that is *no* State Necessity! Tear off the mask, and you see coarse, vulgar avarice lurking under the disguise. The State Necessity of Mr Hastings is a juggle. It is a being that prowls in the dark. It is to be traced in the ravages which it commits, but never in benefits conferred or evils prevented. I can conceive justifiable occasions for the exercise even of outrage, where high public interests demand the sacrifice of private right. If any great man, in bearing the arms of his country—if any admiral, carrying the vengeance and the glory of Britain to distant coasts, should be driven to some rash acts of violence, in order, perhaps, to give food to those who are shedding their blood for their country—there is a State Necessity in such a case, grand, magnanimous, and all-commanding, which goes hand in hand with honour, if not with use! If any great general, defending some fortress, barren, perhaps, itself, but a pledge of the pride and power of Britain—if such a man, fixed like an imperial eagle on the summit of his rock, should strip its sides of the verdure and foliage with which it might be clothed, while covered on the top with that cloud from which he was pouring down his thunders on the foe—would he be brought by the House of Commons to your bar? No, my Lords, never would his grateful and admiring countrymen think of questioning actions which, though accompanied by private wrong, yet were warranted by real necessity. But is the State Necessity which is pleaded by the prisoner, in defence of his conduct, of this description? I challenge him to produce a single instance in which any of his private acts were productive of public advantage, or averted impending evil.

IV. We come now to the treaty of Chunar, which preceded the acceptance of the bribe to which we have already alluded. This transaction, my Lords, had its beginning in corruption, its continuance in fraud, and its end in violence. The first proposition of the nabob was, that our army should be removed and all the English be recalled from his dominions. He declared, to use his own language, that "the English are the bane and ruin of my affairs. Leave my country to myself, and all will yet be recovered." He was aware, my Lords, that though their predecessors had exhausted his revenue; though they had shaken the tree till nothing remained upon its leafless branches, yet that a new flight was upon the wing to watch the first buddings of its prosperity, and to nip every promise of future luxuriance. To the demands of the nabob, Mr Hastings finally acceded. The bribe was the price of his acquiescence. But with the usual perfidy of the prisoner, this condition of the treaty never was performed. You will recollect, my Lords, that Mr Middleton was asked whether the orders which were pretended to be given for the removal of the English were, in any instance, carried into effect? To this question he refused at first to answer, as tending to criminate himself. But when his objection was overruled, and it was decided that he should answer, so much was he agitated, that he lost all memory. It turned out, however, by an amended recollection, that he never received any *direct order* from Mr Hastings. But, my Lords, who can believe that a direct order is necessary when Mr Hastings wants the services of Mr Middleton? Rely upon it, a hint is sufficient to this servile dependant and obsequious parasite. Mr Hastings has only to turn his *eye toward him*—that eye at whose scowl princes turn pale—and his wishes are obeyed.

But, my Lords, this is not the only instance in which the nabob was duped by the bad faith of the prisoner. In the agreement relative to the resumption of the *jaghires*, the prince had demanded and obtained leave to resume those of certain individuals; but Mr Hastings, knowing that there were some favourites of the nabob whom he could not be brought to dispossess, defeated the permission, without the least regard to the existing stipulations to the contrary, by making the order general.

Such, my Lords, is the conduct of which Mr Hastings is capable, not in the moment of cold or crafty policy, but in the hour of confidence, and during the effervescence of his gratitude for a favour received! Thus did he betray the man to whose liberality he stood indebted. Even the gratitude, my Lords, of the prisoner, seems perilous; for we behold here the danger which actually awaited the return he made to an effusion of generosity!

The fact is, my Lords, as appears from the clearest evidence, that when Mr Hastings left Calcutta he had two resources in view, Benares and Oude. The first having failed him, in consequence of the unexpected insurrection which terminated, unhappily for him, in the capture of Bedjigar, he turned his attention to Oude, previously, however, desolating the former province, which he was unable to pillage, destroying and cutting off the very sources of life. Thus frustrated in his original design, the

genius of the prisoner, ever fertile in expedients, fixed itself on the treasures of the begums, and now devised, as an apology for the signal act of cruelty and rapacity which he was meditating, the memorable rebellion; and, to substantiate the participation of these unfortunate princesses in it, he despatched the Chief Justice of India to collect materials.*

The conduct of Sir Elijah Impey in this business, with all deference to the protest which he has entered against being spoken of in a place where he cannot have the privilege of replying, I do not think ought to be passed over without animadversion. Not that I mean to say anything harsh of this elevated character, who was selected to bear forth and to administer to India the blessings of English jurisprudence. I will not question either his feebleness of memory, or dispute in any respect the convenient doctrine which he has set up in his vindication, "that what he ought to have done it is likely he actually did perform." I have always thought, my Lords, that the appointment of the chief justice to so low and nefarious an office as that in which he was employed is one of the strongest aggravations of Mr Hastings' guilt. That an officer, the purity and lustre of whose character should be maintained even in the most domestic retirement; that he, who, if consulting the dignity of British justice, ought to have continued as stationary as his court at Calcutta; that such an exalted character, I repeat, as the Chief Justice of India, should have been forced on a circuit of five hundred miles for the purpose of transacting such a business, was a degradation without example, and a deviation from propriety which has no apology. But, my Lords, this is, in some degree, a question which is to be abstracted for the consideration of those who adorn and illumine the seats of justice in Britain, and the rectitude of whose deportment precludes the necessity of any further observation on so opposite a conduct.

The manner, my Lords, in which Sir Elijah Impey delivered his evidence deserves, also, your attention. He admitted, you will recollect, that, in giving it, he never answered without looking equally to the *probability* and the *fact* in question. Sometimes he allowed circumstances of which he said he had no recollection beyond the mere "probability" that they had taken place. By consulting in this manner what was "probable" and the contrary, he may certainly have corrected his memory at times. I am, at all events, content to accept of this mode of giving his testimony, provided that the converse of the proposition has also a place; and that where a circumstance is *improbable*, a similar degree of credit may be subtracted from the testimony of the witness. Five times in the House of Commons, and twice in this court, for instance, has Sir Elijah Impey borne testimony that a rebellion was raging at Fyzabad [the abode of the begums], at the period of his journey to Lucknow [the residence of the nabob]. Yet, on the eighth examination, he contradicted all the former, and declared that what he meant was, that the rebellion *had* been raging, and the country was then in some degree restored to quiet. The reasons he assigned for the former errors were, that he had forgotten a letter received from Mr Hastings, informing him that the rebellion was quelled, and that he had also forgotten his own proposition of travelling *through* Fyzabad to Lucknow! With respect to the letter, nothing can be said, as it is not in evidence; but the other observation can scarcely be admitted when it is recollected that, in the House of Commons, Sir Elijah Impey declared that it was his proposal to travel through Fyzabad, which had originally brought forth the intelligence that the way was obstructed by the rebellion, and that in consequence of it he altered his route and went by the way of Illahabad. But what is yet more singular is, that on his return he again would have come by the way of Fyzabad, if he had not been once more informed of the danger; so that, had it not been for these friendly informations, the chief justice would have run plump into the very focus of the rebellion!

These, my Lords, are the pretexts by which the fiction of a rebellion was endeavoured to be forced on the public credulity; but the trick is now discovered, and the contriver and the executer are alike exposed to the scorn and derision of the world.

There are two circumstances here which are worthy of remark. The first is, that Sir Elijah Impey, when charged with so dangerous a commission as that of procuring evidence to prove that the begums had meditated the expulsion of the nabob from the throne, and the English from Bengal, twice intended to pass through the city of their residence. But, my Lords, this *giddy* chief justice disregards business. He wants to see the country! Like some *innocent* schoolboy, he takes the primrose

* "The insurrection at Benares happened on the 16th of August, and the treaty was signed at Chunar on the 19th of September. The begums, who had first to hear of the insurrection at Benares [some hundred miles off], and then spread disaffection throughout a great kingdom, had, therefore, little time for the contraction of guilt. And what was the proof upon the strength of which the begums were selected for a singular and aggravated punishment? No direct proof whatever. Hardly an attempt is made to prove anything except a *rumour*. Mr Hastings' friends are produced in great numbers to say that they heard a *rumour!* But before a just judgment can be pronounced, the party accused should be heard in defence. Was this justice afforded to the begums? Not a tittle. Mr Hastings pronounced judgment, and sent his instrument, the nabob, to inflict punishment, *in the first place*. Some time after this was done, he proceeded to collect evidence!"—*Mill's British India*, iv. 380-382.

path, and amuses himself as he goes! He thinks not that his errand is in danger and death, and that his party of pleasure ends in loading others with irons. When at Lucknow, he never mentions the affidavits to the nabob. No! He is too polite. Nor, from the same courtesy, to Mr Hastings. He is, indeed, a master of ceremonies in justice!

When examined, the witness sarcastically remarked "that there must have been a sworn interpreter, from the looks of the manager." How I looked, Heaven knows! but such a physiognomist there is no escaping. He sees a sworn interpreter in my looks! He sees the manner of taking an oath in my looks! He sees the basin of the Ganges in my looks! As for himself, he looks only at the *tops* and *bottoms* of affidavits! In seven years he takes care never to look at these swearings; but when he does examine them, he *knows less* than before.

The other circumstance, my Lords, to which I have alluded, is, that it is fair to presume that Sir Elijah Impey was dissuaded by Mr Hastings and Middleton from passing by the way of Fyzabad, as they well knew that if he approached the begums he would be convinced by their reception of him as the friend of the governor-general, that nothing could be more foreign from the truth than their suspected disaffection. Neither should it escape your notice, my Lords, that while he was taking evidence at Lucknow in the face of day, in support of the charge of rebellion against the princesses, the chief justice heard not a word either from the nabob or his minister, though he frequently conversed with both, of any treasonable machinations or plottings! Equally unaccountable does it appear, that Sir Elijah Impey, who advised the taking of these affidavits for the safety of the prisoner at your bar, did not *read* them at the time to see whether or not they were adequate to this purpose!

At length, it seems, he did read the affidavits, but not till after having declared on oath that he thought it unnecessary. To this he acknowledged he was induced "by having been misled by one of the managers on the part of the Commons, who, by looking at a book which he held in his hand, had entrapped him to own that a sworn interpreter was present when he received these affidavits, and that he was perfectly satisfied with his conduct on the occasion."

Now, my Lords, how I, by merely looking into a book, could *intimate* the presence of an interpreter, and could also *look* the satisfaction conceived by the chief justice on the occasion, when it clearly appears by the evidence that there was *no* interpreter present, are points which I believe he alone can explain!

I will concede to the witness, as he seems desirous it should be done, that he did not strictly attend to form when taking these affidavits. I will admit that he merely directed the Bible to be offered to the whites, and the Koran to the blacks, and packed up their depositions in his wallet without any examination. Or, I will admit that he glanced them over in India, having previously cut off all communication between his eye and his mind, so that nothing was transferred from the one to the other. Extraordinary as these circumstances certainly are, I will, nevertheless, admit them all; or if it be preferred by the prisoner, I will admit that the affidavits were legally and properly taken; for, in whatever light they may be received, I will prove that they are not sufficient to sustain a single allegation of criminality against those they were designed to inculpate.

But it is to these documents, my Lords, such as they are, that the defence of the prisoner is principally confided; and on the degree of respect which may be given to them by your Lordships does the event of this trial materially depend.

Considered, therefore, in this view, I shall presently solicit your Lordships' attention, while I examine them at some length, and with some care. But before I enter into the analysis of the testimony, permit me to remind the Court that the charge against the Princesses of Oude, to substantiate which these affidavits were taken, consisted originally of two allegations. They were accused of a *uniform spirit of hostility to the British government*, as well as *the overt act of rebellion*. But, my Lords, the first part of the charge the counsel for the prisoner has been compelled to abandon, not being able to get one fact out of the whole farrago of these depositions to support it.

When the half of an accusation is thus deserted for the want of proof, is it not natural for us to suspect the whole? I do not say that it absolutely shows the falsity of it, nor do I mean to employ such an argument; but I maintain that it should influence the mind so far as to make it curious and severely inquisitive into the other branch of the charge, and to render it distrustful of its truth.

But in this particular case the Court have an additional motive for jealousy and suspicion. It will not escape the recollection of your Lordships, in weighing the validity of the allegation which now remains to be considered, namely, "that the begums influenced the jaghiredars,* and excited the discontents in Oude," what were the circumstances in which it arose, and by whom it was preferred. You will bear in mind, my Lords, that it appears in evidence that Mr Hastings left Calcutta in the year 1781, for the avowed purpose of collecting a large sum of money, and that he had only two resources

* Persons holding jaghires. The jaghire is a fief or lordship granted to an individual for life, generally for military purposes.

Failing in Benares, as we have already seen, he next lays his rapacious hand on the treasures of the begums. Here, then, we have in the person of the prisoner both the accuser and the judge. With much caution, therefore, should this judge be heard, who has, apparently at least, a profit in the conviction, and an interest in the condemnation of the party to be tried. I say nothing of the gross turpitude of such a double character, nor of the frontless disregard of all those feelings which revolt at mixing offices so distinct and incompatible.

The next point which I wish to press on your Lordships' consideration, previously to my taking up the affidavits, is the infinite improbability of the attempt which is alleged to have been made by the begums to dethrone the nabob and exterminate the English. Estimating the power of the princesses at the highest standard, it manifestly was not in their reach to accomplish any overthrow, decisive or even momentary, of their sovereign, much less of the English. I am not so weak, however, as to argue that, because the success of an enterprise seems impossible, and no adequate reason can be assigned for undertaking it, that it will therefore never be attempted; or that, because the begums had no interest in exciting a rebellion, or sufficient prospect of succeeding in it, they are innocent of the charge. I cannot look at the prisoner without knowing, and being compelled to confess that there *are* persons of such a turn of mind as to prosecute mischief without interest; and that there *are* passions of the human soul which lead, without a motive, to the perpetration of crimes.

I do not, therefore, my Lords, wish it to be understood that I am contending that the charge is rendered, by the matter I have stated, absolutely false. All I mean is, that an accusation, made under such circumstances, should be received with much doubt and circumspection; and that your Lordships, remembering how it is preferred, will accompany me through the discussion of the affidavits, free and uninfluenced by any bias derived from the positive manner in which the guilt of the begums has been pronounced.

We now come to the examination of this mass of evidence which Mr Hastings conceives of so much consequence to his acquittal on the present charge. In the defence which has been submitted to your Lordships, the prisoner complains most bitterly that the chief mover of the prosecution treated these affidavits in his *peculiar manner*. What the *peculiar manner* of my honourable friend [Mr Burke], here alluded to, was, I cannot tell. But I will say, that if he treated them in any other way than as the most rash, irregular, and irrelevant testimony which was ever brought before a judicial tribunal, he did not do as they deserved. The prisoner has had, moreover, the hardihood to assert that they were taken for the purpose of procuring the best possible information of the state of the country, and of the circumstances of the insurrection; and being, therefore, merely accessory evidence in the present case, were entitled to more weight. This I declare, without hesitation, to be a falsehood. They were taken, I aver, for the sole and exclusive purpose of vindicating the plunder of the begums. They were taken to justify what was afterward to be done. Disappointed at Benares, he turned to the remaining resource, the treasures of the princesses; and prepared, as a pretext for his meditated robbery, these documents.

I shall proceed to examine the affidavits severally, as far as they relate to the charge against the begums. They really contain, my Lords, nothing except vague rumour and improbable surmise. It is stated, for example, by one of those deponents, a black officer in a regiment of sepoys, that having a considerable number of persons as hostages in a fort where he commanded, who were sent thither by Colonel Hannay, the country people surrounded the fort and demanded their release; but instead of complying with their demand, he put twenty of these hostages to death; and on a subsequent day the heads of eighteen more were struck off, including the head of a great rajah. In consequence of this last execution, the populace became exceedingly exasperated, and among the crowd several persons were heard to say, that the begums had offered a reward of a thousand rupees for the head of every European, one hundred for the head of every sepoy officer, and ten for the head of a common sepoy. Now, my Lords, it appears pretty clearly that no such reward was ever offered; for, when this garrison evacuated the fort, the people told Captain Gordon, who then commanded it, that if he would deliver up his arms and baggage, they would permit him and his men to continue their march unmolested. So little did the people, indeed, think of enriching themselves by this process of decapitation, that, when the detachment of British forces was reduced to *ten men*, and when of course the slaughter of them would have been a work of no danger or difficulty, they were still permitted to proceed on their route without any interruption.

Captain Gordon himself *supposes* that the begums encouraged the country people to rise, because, when he arrived at the bank of the river Saunda Nutta, at the opposite side of which stands the town of Nutta, the fowzdar, or governor, who commanded there for the bow [younger] begum, in whose jaghire the town lay, did not *instantly* send boats to carry him and his men over the river; and because the fowzdar [governor] pointed two or three guns across the river. Even admitting this statement to be true, I cannot see how it is to affect the begums. Where is the symptom of hostility? Surely it was the duty of the commanding officer of the fort not to

let any troops pass until he ascertained who they were, and for what purpose they came. To have done otherwise would have been unmilitary, and a violation of the most sacred duties of his station. But, my Lords, after a while Captain Gordon crosses the river, and finds himself in a place of safety as soon as he enters a town which was under *the authority of the begums*, where he was treated with kindness, and afterward sent with a *protecting guard* to Colonel Hannay. This last circumstance, which is mentioned in the first affidavit of Captain Gordon, is suppressed in the second, for what purpose it is obvious. But let us attend to the testimony of Hyder Beg Cawn, who, as the minister of the nabob, was the person, certainly, of all others, the best acquainted with the transactions then passing in the country. Though with every source of intelligence open to him, and swearing both to rumour and to fact, he does not mention a syllable in proof of the pretended rebellion which was to dethrone his sovereign, nor even hint at anything of the kind.

Neither, my Lords, is the evidence of the English officers more conclusive. That of Mr Middleton, which has been so much relied upon, contains but a single passage which is at all pertinent, and this is not legal evidence. He says, "There was *a general report* that the begums had given much encouragement and some aid to the jaghiredars in resisting the resumption, and that he had *heard* there had been a good disposition in them toward the Rajah Cheyte Sing." His evidence is mere hearsay. He knows nothing of himself. He saw no insurrection. He met with no unfriendly dispositions. But on the mere rumours which he had stated did this conscientious servant of Mr Hastings with promptitude execute the scheme of plunder which his master had devised.

The testimony of Colonel Hannay is of the same description. He simply states that "three zemindars *told* him that they were credibly informed that the begums had a hostile design against the nabob." When asked who these zemindars were, he replied that he was not at liberty to disclose their names. They had made the communication to him under an express injunction of secrecy which he could not violate.

There is also the deposition of a Frenchman, which is drawn up quite in the style of magnificence and glitter which belongs to his nation. He talks of having penetrated immeasurable wilds; of having seen tigers and other prowling monsters of the forest; of having surveyed mountains, and navigated streams; of having been entertained in palaces and menaced with dungeons; of having heard a *number of rumours*, but that he never saw any rebellious or hostile appearances.

Such, my Lords, are the contents of these memorable depositions, on which the prisoner relies as a vindication of an act of the most transcendent rapacity and injustice of which there is any record or tradition.

I know, my Lords, that if I were in a court of law, sitting merely to try the question of the validity of this testimony, to rise in order to comment upon it, I should be prevented from proceeding. By the bench I should be asked, "What do you mean to do? There is nothing in these affidavits upon which we can permit you for a minute to occupy the time of the Court. There is not, from the beginning to the end, one particle of legal, substantial, or even defensible proof. There is nothing except hearsay and rumour." But though, my Lords, I am persuaded that such would be the admonition which I should receive from the Court, yet, being exceedingly anxious to meet everything at your Lordships' bar on which the prisoner can build the smallest degree of dependence, I must pray your indulgence while I examine separately the points which are attempted to be set up by these affidavits.

They are three in number:

1. That the begums gave assistance to Cheyte Sing, Rajah of Benares.

2. That they encouraged and assisted the *jaghiredars* to resist the resumption of the *jaghires*.

And,

3. That they were the principal movers of all the commotions in Oude.

These, my Lords, are the three allegations that the affidavits are to sustain, and which are accompanied with the general charge that the begums were in rebellion.

(1.) Of the rebellion here pretended, I cannot, my Lords, find a trace. With the care and indefatigable industry of an antiquary, hunting for some precious vestige which is to decide the truth of his speculations, have I searched for the evidence of it. Though we have heard it spoken of with as much certainty as the one which happened in Scotland in the year 1745, not the slightest appearance of it can I discover. I am unable to ascertain either the time when, or the place where it raged. No army has been seen to collect; no battle to be fought; no blood to be spilt. It was a rebellion which had for its object the destruction of no human creature but those who *planned* it—it was a rebellion which, according to Mr Middleton's expression, no man, either *horse* or *foot*, ever marched to quell! The chief justice was the only one who took the field against it. The force against which it was raised instantly *withdrew* to give it elbow-room; and even then, it was a rebellion which perversely showed itself in acts of *hospitality* to the nabob whom it was to dethrone, and to the English whom it was to extirpate! Beginning in *nothing*, it continued *without raging*, and ended *as it originated!*

If, my Lords, rebellions of this mysterious nature can happen, it is time to look about us. Who can say that one does not now exist which

menaces our safety? Perhaps at the very moment I am speaking one ravages our city! Perhaps it may be by lying *perdue* in a neighbouring village! Perhaps, like the ostentatious encampment which has given celebrity to Brentford and Ealing, it may have fixed its quarters at Hammersmith or Islington, ready to pour down its violence at the approach of night!

But, my Lords, let us endeavour to fix the time when this horrid rebellion occurred. To the 1st of August 1781, it is clear there was none. At this date letters were received from Colonel Morgan, the commanding officer of Oude, who is silent on the subject. On the 27th of September, he gives an account of some insurrections *at Lucknow*, the seat of the court, but of *none at Fyzabad*, where the begums resided. Nearly of the same date there is a letter from Major Hannay, then at the rajah's court, in which the state of his affairs are described, but no suspicion expressed of his being assisted by the begums.

At this time, therefore, there was certainly no rebellion or disaffection displayed. Nay, we find, on the contrary, the nabob going to visit his mother, the very princess who is charged with revolting against his authority. But, my Lords, it is alleged that he was attended by two thousand horse, and the inference is drawn by the counsel of the prisoner that he took this military force to quell the insurrection; to confirm which they appealed to Mr Middleton, who, being asked whether these troops were well appointed, caught in an instant a gleam of *martial memory*, and answered in the affirmative. Unfortunately, however, for the martial memory of Mr Middleton, it is stated by Captain Edwards, who was with the nabob as his aide-de-camp, that there were not more than five or six hundred horse, and these so bad and miserably equipped that they were unable to keep up with him, so that very few were near his person or within the reach of his command. That of these few, the most were mutinous from being ill paid, and were rather disposed to promote than put down any insurrection. But, my Lords, I will concede to the prisoner the full amount of military force for which he anxiously contends. I will allow the whole two thousand cavalry to enter in a gallop into the very city of Fyzabad. For, has not Captain Edwards proved that they were only the usual guard of the nabob? Has not, moreover, Mr Middleton himself declared, rather indiscreetly, I confess, "that it is the constant custom of the princes of India to travel with a great equipage, and that it would be considered an unpardonable disrespect to the person visited were they to come unescorted." This, my Lords, is really the truth. The Indian princes never perform a journey without a splendid retinue. The habits of the East require ostentation and parade. They do not, as the princes of Europe —who, sometimes from one motive and sometimes from another, at times from political views and at times from curiosity, travel, some to France to learn manners, and others to England to learn liberty—choose to be relieved from the pomps of state and the drudgery of equipage. But, my Lords, perhaps, in this instance, the nabob, wishing to adapt himself to the service on which he was going, did dispense with his usual style. Hearing of a rebellion without an army, he may have thought that it could only, with propriety, be attacked by a *prince* without a *guard!*

It has also been contended, my Lords, in proof of this rebellion, that one thousand nudgies were raised at Fyzabad, and sent to the assistance of Cheyte Sing.

It is deemed a matter of no consequence that the officer second in command to the rajah [Cheyte Sing], has positively sworn that these troops came from Lucknow, and not from Fyzabad. This the prisoner wishes to have considered as only the trifling mistake of the name of one capital for another. But he has found it more difficult to get over the fact which has been attested by the same witness, that the troops were of a different description from those in the service of the begums, being *matchlock*, and not *swords* men. It is, therefore, manifest that the troops were not furnished by the princesses, and it seems highly probable that they did come from Lucknow; not that they were sent by the nabob, but by some of the powerful *jaghiredars* who have uniformly avowed an aversion to the English.

It has been more than once mentioned by some of the witnesses, my Lords, that Sabid Ally, the younger son of the bow [younger] begum, was deeply and criminally concerned in these transactions. Why was he, therefore, permitted to escape with impunity? To this question Sir Elijah Impey gave a very satisfactory answer when he informed us that the young man was miserably poor, and a bankrupt. Here is a complete solution of the enigma. There never enters into the mind of Mr Hastings a suspician of treason where there is no *treasure!* Sabid Ally found, therefore, protection in his poverty, and safety in his insolvency. My Lords, the political sagacity of Mr Hastings exhibits the converse of the doctrine which the experience of history has established. Hitherto it has generally been deemed that the possession of property attaches a person to the country which contains it, and makes him cautious how he hazards any enterprise which might be productive of innovation, or draw upon him the suspicion or displeasure of Government; and that, on the contrary, the needy, having no permanent stake, are always desperate, and easily seduced into commotions which promise any change; but, my Lords, the prisoner, inverting this doctrine, has, in the true spirit of rapacity and speculation which belongs to him, never failed

to recognise loyalty in *want*, and to discern treason in *wealth!*

Allow me now, my Lords, to lay before you some of those proofs which we have collected of the steady friendship and good dispositions of the begums to the English interests. I have in my hands a letter from one of them, which I will read, complaining of the cruel and unjust suspicions that were entertained of her fidelity. Your Lordships must perceive the extraordinary energy which the plain and simple language of truth gives to her representations. Her complaints are eloquence; her supplications, persuasion; her remonstrances, conviction.

I call, moreover, the attention of the Court to the interference of the bow [younger] begum in behalf of Captain Gordon, by which his life was saved, at a moment when, if the princesses wished to strike a blow against the English, they might have done it with success. This man, whose life was thus preserved, and who, in the first burst of the natural feelings of his heart, poured forth his grateful acknowledgments of the obligation, afterwards became the instrument of the destruction of his protectress. I will produce the letter wherein he thanks her for her interference, and confesses that he owes his life to her bounty.

It has been asked, with an air of some triumph, why Captain Gordon was not called to the bar? Why call him to the bar? Would he not, as he has done in his affidavit, suppress the portion of testimony we require? I trust that he may never be brought to swear in this case till he becomes sensible of his guilt, and feels an ardent, contrite zeal to do justice to his benefactress, and to render her the most ample atonement for the injuries which she has sustained by his ingratitude and wickedness. The conduct of Captain Gordon, in this instance, is so astonishingly depraved, that I confess I am in some degree disposed to incredulity. I can scarcely believe it possible that, after having repeatedly acknowledged that he owed his life and liberty to her beneficent hand, he could so far forget these obligations, as spontaneously, and of his own free will, to come forward, and expend a part of that breath which she had preserved, in an affidavit by which her ruin was to be effected! My knowledge of the human heart will hardly permit me to think that any rational being could deliberately commit an act of such wanton atrocity. I must imagine that there has been some scandalous deception; that, led on by Mr Middleton, he made his deposition, ignorant to what purpose it would be applied. Every feeling of humanity recoils at the transaction viewed in any other light. It is incredible that any intelligent person could be capable of standing up in the presence of God, and of exclaiming, "To you, my benevolent friend, the breath I now draw, next to Heaven, I owe to you. My existence is an emanation from your bounty. I am indebted to you beyond all possibility of return, and therefore my *gratitude* shall be your *destruction!*"

If, my Lords—if I am right in my conjecture, that Captain Gordon was thus seduced into the overthrow of his benefactress, I hope he will present himself at your bar, and, by stating the imposition which was practised upon him, vindicate his own character, and that of human nature, from this foul imputation.

The original letters which passed on this occasion between Captain Gordon and the begum were transmitted by her to Mr Middleton, for the purpose of being shown to the governor-general. These letters Mr Middleton endeavoured to conceal. His letter-book, into which they were transcribed, is despoiled of those leaves which contained them. When questioned about them, he said that he had deposited Persian copies of the letters in the office at Lucknow, and that he did not bring translations of them with him to Calcutta, because he left the former city the very next day after receiving the originals; but, my Lords, I will boldly assert that this pretext is a *black and barefaced perjury.* It can be proved that Middleton received the letters at least a month before he departed from Lucknow. He left that city on the 17th of October, and he received them on the 20th of the preceding month. Well aware that by these documents the purity of the begums' intentions would be made manifest; that, while accused of disaffection, their attachment was fully displayed, he, as their punishment was predetermined, found it necessary to suppress the testimonials of their innocence; but, my Lords, these letters, covered as they were by every artifice which the vilest ingenuity could devise to hide them, have been discovered, and are now bared to view by the aid of that Power to whom all creation must bend—to whom nothing, in the whole system of thought or action, is impossible; who can invigorate the arm of infancy with a giant's nerve; who can bring light out of darkness, and good out of evil; can view the confines of hidden mischief, and drag forth each minister of guilt from amid his deeds of darkness and disaster, reluctant, alas! and unrepenting, to exemplify, at least, if not atone, and to qualify any casual sufferings of innocence by the final doom of its opposite; to prove there are the never-failing corrections of God, to make straight the obliquity of man!

My Lords, the prisoner, in his defence, has ascribed the benevolent interposition of the begum in favour of Captain Gordon to her knowledge of the successes of the English. This is an imputation as ungenerous as it is false. The only success which the British troops met with at this time was that of Colonel Blair, on 3d of September; but he himself acknowledged, that another victory gained at such a loss would be

equal to a defeat. The reports that were circulated throughout the country, so far from being calculated to strike the princesses with awe of the English, were entirely the reverse. These were, that Mr Hastings had been slain at Benares, and that the English had sustained the most disastrous defeats.

But, my Lords, to remove every doubt from your minds, I will recur to what never fails me —the evidence of the prisoner against himself. In a letter to the council, which is on record, he confesses that, from the 22d of August to the 22d of September, he was confined in a situation of the utmost hazard; that his safety during this period was exceedingly precarious, and that the affairs of the English were generally thought to be unfavourable in the extreme. In his defence, however, Mr Hastings has forgotten entirely these admissions. It certainly appears that the princesses demonstrated the firmness of their attachment to the British; not in the season of prosperity or triumph; not from the impulse of fear, nor the prospect of future protection; but that they, with a magnanimity almost unexampled, came forward at a moment when the hoard of collected vengeance was about to burst over our heads; when the measure of European guilt in India was completely filled by the oppressions which had just been exercised on the unfortunate Cheyte Sing; and when offended Heaven seemed, at last, to interfere to change the meek dispositions of the natives, to awaken their resentment, and to inspirit their revenge.

(2.) On the *second* allegation, my Lords, namely, "That the begums encouraged and aided the *jaghiredars*," I do not think it necessary to say much. It is evident, from the letters of Mr Middleton, that no such aid was required to awaken resentments, which must, indeed, unavoidably have arisen from the nature of an affair in which so many powerful interests were involved. The *jaghires* depending were of an immense amount, and as their owners, by the resumption of them, would be at once reduced to poverty and distress, they wanted surely no new instigation to resistance. It is ridiculous to attempt to impute to the begums, without a shadow of proof, the inspiring of sentiments which must inevitably have been excited in the breast of every *jaghiredar* by the contemplation of the injury and injustice which were intended to be done him. Reluctant to waste the time of the Court, I will dismiss the discussion of this charge by appealing to your Lordships individually to determine, whether, on a proposal being made to *confiscate* your several estates (and the cases are precisely analogous), the incitements of any two ladies of this kingdom would be at all required to kindle your resentments and to rouse you to opposition?

(3.) The commotions, my Lords, which prevailed in Oude have also been attributed to the begums, and constitute the *third* and remaining allegation against them. But these disorders, I confidently aver, were, on the contrary, the work of the English, which I will show by the most incontestable evidence.

They were produced by their rapacity and violence, and not by the "perfidious artifices" of these old women. To drain the province of its money, every species of cruelty, of extortion, of rapine, of stealth, was employed by the emissaries of Mr Hastings. The nabob perceived the growing discontents among the people, and, alarmed at the consequences, endeavoured, by the strongest representations, to rid his devoted country of the oppressions of its invaders, and particularly from the vulture grasp of Colonel Hannay; swearing by Mohammed that if "this tyrant were not removed he would quit the province," as a residence in it was no longer to be endured.* Thus this mild people suffered for a while in barren anguish and ineffectual bewailings. At length, however, in their meek bosoms, where injury never before begot resentment, nor despair aroused to courage, increased oppression had its effect. They determined on resistance. They collected round their implacable foe [Colonel Hannay], and had nearly sacrificed him. So deeply were they impressed with the sense of their wrongs, that they would not even accept of life from their oppressors. They threw themselves upon the swords of the soldiery, and sought death as the only termination of their sorrows and persecutions. Of a people thus injured and thus feeling, it is an audacious fallacy to attribute their conduct to any external impulse. My Lords, the true cause of it is to be traced to the first-born principles of man. It grows with his growth; it strengthens with his strength. It teaches him to understand; it enables him to feel. For where there is human fate, can there be a penury of human feeling? Where there is injury, will there not be resentment? Is not despair to be followed by courage? The God of battles pervades and penetrates the inmost spirit of man, and, rousing him to shake off the burden that is grievous, and the yoke that is galling, reveals the law written on his heart, and the duties and privileges of his nature.

If, my Lords, a stranger had at this time entered the province of Oude, ignorant of what had happened since the death of Sujah Dowlah —that prince who with a savage heart had still great lines of character, and who, with all his ferocity in war, had, with a cultivating hand, preserved to his country the wealth which it derived from benignant skies and a prolific soil

* "When Colonel Hannay entered the service of the nabob, being sent there by Hastings with British troops, he was a man in debt. He was described by one of the witnesses as 'involved in his circumstances.' At the end of three years, he was understood to have realised a fortune of *three hundred thousand pounds sterling!*"—*Goodrich.*

—if, observing the wide and general devastation of fields unclothed and brown; of vegetation burned up and extinguished; of villages depopulated and in ruin; of temples unroofed and perishing; of reservoirs broken down and dry, this stranger should ask, "What has thus laid waste this beautiful and opulent land; what monstrous madness has ravaged with widespread war; what desolating foreign foe; what civil discords; what disputed succession; what religious zeal; what fabled monster has stalked abroad, and, with malice and mortal enmity to man, withered by the grasp of death every growth of nature and humanity, all means of delight, and each original, simple principle of bare existence?" the answer would have been, "Not one of these causes! No wars have ravaged these lands and depopulated these villages! No desolating foreign foe! No domestic broils! No disputed succession! No religious, superserviceable zeal! No poisonous monster! No affliction of Providence, which, while it scourged us, cut off the sources of resuscitation! No! This damp of death is the mere effusion of British amity! We sink under the pressure of their support! We writhe under their perfidious gripe! They have embraced us with their protecting arms, and lo! these are the fruits of their alliance?"

What then, my Lords! shall we bear to be told that, under such circumstances, the exasperated feelings of a whole people, thus spurred on to clamour and resistance, were excited by the poor and feeble influence of the begums? After hearing the description given by an eye-witness [Colonel Naylor, successor of Hannay]* of the paroxysm of fever and delirium into which despair threw the natives when on the banks of the polluted Ganges, panting for breath, they tore more widely open the lips of their gaping wounds, to accelerate their dissolution; and while their blood was issuing, presented their ghastly eyes to heaven, breathing their last and fervent prayer that the dry earth might not be suffered to drink their blood, but that it might rise up to the throne of God, and rouse the eternal Providence to avenge the wrongs of their country—will it be said that all this was brought about by the incantations of these begums in their secluded zenana; or that they could inspire this enthusiasm and this despair into the breasts of a people who felt no grievance, and had suffered no torture? What motive, then, could have such influence in their bosom? What motive! That which nature, the common parent, plants in the bosom of man; and which, though it may be less active in the Indian than in the Englishman, is still congenial with, and makes a part of his being. That feeling which tells him that man was never made to be the property of man; but that, when in the pride and insolence of power, one human creature dares to tyrannise over another, it is a power usurped, and resistance is a duty. That principle which tells him that resistance to power usurped is not merely a duty which he owes to himself and to his neighbour, but a duty which he owes to his God, in asserting and maintaining the rank which He gave him in his creation. That principle which neither the rudeness of ignorance can stifle, nor the enervation of refinement extinguish! That principle which makes it base for a man to suffer when he ought to act; which, tending to preserve to the species the original designations of Providence, spurns at the arrogant distinctions of man, and indicates the independent quality of his race.

I trust now that your Lordships can feel no hesitation in acquitting the unfortunate princesses of this allegation. But though the innocence of the begums may be confessed, it does not necessarily follow, I am ready to allow, that the prisoner must be guilty. There is a possibility that he might have been deluded by others, and incautiously led into a false conclusion. If this be proved, my Lords, I will cheerfully abandon the present charge. But if, on the other hand, it shall appear, as I am confident it will, that in his subsequent conduct there was a mysterious concealment denoting conscious guilt; if all his narrations of the business be found marked with inconsistency and contradiction, there can be, I think, a doubt no longer entertained of his criminality.

It will be easy, my Lords, to prove that such concealment was actually practised. From the month of September, in which the seizure of the treasures took place, till the succeeding January, no intimation whatever was given of it by Mr Hastings to the council at Calcutta. But, my Lords, look at the mode in which this concealment is attempted to be evaded. The first pretext is, *the want of leisure!* Contemptible falsehood! He could amuse his fancy at this juncture with the composition of Eastern tales, but to give an account of a rebellion which convulsed an empire, or of his acquiring so large an amount of treasure, he had *no time!*

The second pretext is, that all communication between Calcutta and Fyzabad was cut off. This is no less untrue. By comparing dates, it will be seen that letters, now in our possession, passed at this period between Mr Middleton and the prisoner. Even Sir Elijah Impey has unguardedly declared that the road leading from the one city to the other was as clear from interruption as that between London and any of the neighbouring villages. So satisfied am I, indeed, on this point, that I am willing to lay aside every other topic of criminality against the prisoner, and to rest this prosecution alone on the question of the validity of the reasons assigned for the.

* This is considered by many as the most graphic and powerful description to be found in the speeches of Mr Sheridan.

concealment we have alleged. Let those, my Lords, who still retain any doubts on the subject, turn to the prisoner's narrative of his journey to Benares. They will there detect, amid a motley mixture of cant and mystery, of rhapsody and enigma, the most studious concealment.

It may, perhaps, be asked, why did Mr Hastings use all these efforts to veil this business? Though it is not strictly incumbent on me to give an answer to the question, yet I will say that he had obviously a reason for it. Looking to the natural effect of deep injuries on the human mind, he thought that oppression must beget resistance. The attempt which the begums might be driven to make in their own defence, though really the *effect*, he was determined to represent as the *cause* of his proceedings. He was here only repeating the experiment which he so successfully performed in the case of Cheyte Sing. Even when disappointed in those views by the natural meekness and submission of the princesses, he could not relinquish the scheme; and hence, in his letter to the Court of Directors, January 5, 1782, he represents the *subsequent* disturbances in Oude as the cause of the violent measures he had adopted *two months* previous to the existence of these disturbances! He there congratulates his masters on the seizure of the treasures which he declares, by the law of Mohammed, were the property of Asoph ul Dowlah.

My Lords, the prisoner more than once assured the House of Commons that the inhabitants of Asia believed him to be a preternatural being, gifted with good fortune or the peculiar favourite of Heaven; and that Providence never failed to take up and carry, by wise but hidden means, every project of his to its destined end. Thus, in his blasphemous and vulgar puritanical jargon, did Mr Hastings libel the course of Providence. Thus, according to him, when his corruptions and briberies were on the eve of exposure, Providence inspired the heart of Nuncomar to commit a low, base crime, in order to save him from ruin.* Thus, also, in his attempts on Cheyte Sing, and his plunder of the begums, Providence stepped forth, and inspired the one with resistance and the other with rebellion, to forward his purposes! Thus, my Lords, did he arrogantly represent himself as a man not only the favourite of Providence, but as one for whose sake Providence departed from the eternal course of its own wise dispensations, to assist his administration by the elaboration of all that is deleterious and ill; *heaven-born forgeries—inspired treasons—providential rebellions!* arraigning that Providence—

"Whose works are goodness, and whose ways are right."

It does undoubtedly, my Lords, bear a strange appearance, that a man of reputed ability, like the prisoner, even when acting wrongly, should have recourse to so many bungling artifices, and spread so thin a veil over his deceptions. But those who are really surprised at this circumstance must have attended very little to the demeanour of Mr Hastings. Through the whole of his defence upon this charge, sensible that truth would undo him, he rests his hopes on falsehood. Observing this rule, he has drawn together a set of falsehoods without consistency, and without connection; not knowing, or not remembering, that there is nothing which requires so much care in the fabrication, as a system of lies. The series must be regular and unbroken; but his falsehoods are eternally at variance, and demolish one another. Indeed, in all his conduct, he seems to be actuated but by one principle, to do things contrary to the established form. This architect militates against the first principles of the art. He begins with the frieze and the capital, and lays the base of the column at the top. Thus turning his edifice upside down, he plumes himself upon the novelty of his idea, till it comes tumbling about his ears. Rising from these ruins, he is soon found rearing a similar structure. He delights in difficulties, and disdains a plain and secure foundation. He loves, on the contrary, to build on a precipice, and to encamp on a mine. Inured to falls, he fears not danger. Frequent defeats have given him a hardihood, without impressing a sense of disgrace.

It was once, my Lords, a maxim, as much admitted in the practice of common life as in the schools of philosophy, that where Heaven is inclined to destroy, it begins with frenzying the intellect. "Quem Deus vult perdere prius dementat." This doctrine the right honourable manager (Mr Burke), who opened generally to your Lordships the articles of impeachment, still further extended. He declared that the coexistence of *vice* and *prudence* was incompatible; that the vicious man, being deprived of his best energies, and curtailed in his proportion of understanding, was left with such a short-sighted penetration as could lay no claim to *prudence*. This is the sentiment of my noble and exalted friend, whose name I can never mention but with respect and admiration due to his virtue and talents; whose proud disdain of vice can only be equalled by the ability with which he exposes and controls it; to whom I look up with homage; whose genius is commensurate with philanthropy; whose memory will stretch itself beyond the fleeting objects of any little partial shuffling—through the whole wide range of human knowledge and honourable aspiration after good—as large as the system which forms life—as lasting

* Nuncomar, a Hindoo of high rank, who at one time accused Hastings of receiving bribes. He was at the same time accused by Hastings of forging a bond, when he was arraigned before the Supreme Court of Bengal and condemned to death.

as those objects which adorn it; but in this sentiment, so honourable to my friend, I cannot implicitly agree. If the true definition of prudence be the successful management and conduct of a purpose to its end, I can at once bring instances into view where this species of prudence belonged to minds distinguished by the atrocity of their actions. When I survey the history of a Philip of Macedon, of a Cæsar, of a Cromwell, I perceive great guilt successfully conducted, if not by legitimate discretion, at least by a consummate *craft*, or by an all-commanding sagacity, productive of precisely the same effects. These, however, I confess, were isolated characters, who left the vice they dared to follow either in the state of dependent vassalage, or involved it in destruction, Such is the perpetual law of nature, that virtue, whether placed in a circle, more contracted or enlarged, moves with sweet concert. There is no dissonance to jar; no asperity to divide; and that harmony which makes its felicity at the same time constitutes its protection. Of vice, on the contrary, the parts are disunited, and each in barbarous language clamours for its pre-eminence. It is a scene where, though one domineering passion may have sway, the others still press forward with their dissonant claims; and, in the moral world, effects waiting on their causes, the discord which results, of course, ensures defeat.

In this way, my Lords, I believe the failure of Mr Hastings is to be explained, and such, I trust, will be the fate of all who shall emulate his character or his conduct. The doctrine of my friend, from what I have said, can, therefore, hold only in those minds which cannot be satisfied with the indulgence of a single crime; where, instead of one base master passion having the complete sway, to which all the faculties are subject, and on which alone the mind is bent, there is a combustion and rivalry among a number of passions yet baser, when pride, vanity, avarice, lust of power, cruelty, all at once actuate the human soul and distract its functions; all of them at once filling their several spaces, some in their larger, some in their more contracted orbits; all of them struggling for preeminence, and each counteracting the other. In such a mind, undoubtedly, great crimes can never be accompanied by prudence. There is a fortunate disability, occasioned by the contention, that rescues the human species from the villainy of the intention. Such is the original denunciation of nature. Not so with the nobler passions. In the breast where they reside, the harmony is never interrupted by the number. A perfect and substantial agreement gives an accession of vigour to each, and, spreading their influence in every direction, like the divine intelligence and benignity from which they flow, they ascertain it to the individual by which they are possessed, and communicate it to the society of which he is a member.

My Lords, I shall now revert again to the claims made on the Princesses of Oude. The counsel for the prisoner have laboured to impress on the Court the idea that the nabob was a prince sovereignly independent, and in no degree subject to the control of Mr Hastings; but, after the numberless proofs we have adduced of his being, on the contrary, a mere cipher in the hands of the governor-general, your Lordships will require of them, to create such a conviction on your minds, much more conclusive evidence than any which they have hitherto presented. I believe, both as regards the resumption of the *jaghires*, and especially the seizure of the treasures, they will find it very difficult to show the independence of the prince.

It has, my Lords, been strenuously contended on our parts that the measure of seizing the treasures originated *with the prisoner*, and in maintenance of the position we have brought forward a chain of testimony clear, and, we think, satisfactory; but the counsel for the prisoner, on the other hand, assert with equal earnestness, that the proposition for seizing the treasures came originally from *the nabob*. It is therefore incumbent on them to support their assertion by proof, as we have done. Certainly the best evidence of the fact would be the exhibition of the letter of the nabob to Mr Hastings, in which they allege the proposition was made. Why, then, is not this document, which must at once settle all disputation on the subject, produced? The truth is, there is no such letter. I peremptorily deny it, and challenge the prisoner and his counsel to produce a letter or paper containing any proposition of the kind coming immediately from the prince.

My Lords, the seizure of the treasures and the *jaghires* was the effect of a dark *conspiracy*, in which six persons were concerned. Three of the conspirators were of a higher order. These were Mr Hastings, who may be considered as the principal and leader in this black affair; Mr Middleton, the English resident at Lucknow; and Sir Elijah Impey. The three inferior or subordinate conspirators were Hyder Beg Cawn, the nominal minister of the nabob, but in reality the creature of Mr Hastings, Colonel Hannay, and Ali Ibrahim Khan.

Sir Elijah Impey was entrusted by Mr Hastings to carry his orders to Mr Middleton, and to concert with him the means of carrying them into execution. The chief justice, my Lords, being a principal actor in the whole of this iniquitous business, it will be necessary to take notice of some parts of the evidence which he has delivered upon oath at your Lordships' bar.

When asked what became of the Persian affidavits sworn before him, after he had delivered them to Mr Hastings, he replied that *he really did not know!* He was also asked if he had them translated, or knew of their having been

translated, or had any conversation with Mr Hastings on the subject of the affidavits. He replied, "that he knew nothing at all of their having been translated, and that he had no conversation whatever with Mr Hastings on the subject of the affidavits after he had delivered them to him." He was next asked whether he did not think it a little singular that he should not have held any conversation with the governor-general on a subject of so much moment as that of the affidavits which he had taken. His answer was that he did not think it singular, because he left Chunar the very day after he delivered the affidavits to Mr Hastings. By this answer the witness certainly meant it should be understood that when he quitted Chunar he left the governor-general behind him; but it appears, from letters written by the witness himself, and which we have already laid before the Court, that he arrived at Chunar on the 1st of December 1781; that he then began to take the affidavits, and, when completed, he and Mr Hastings *left Chunar in company*, and set out on the road to Benares; and that, after being together from the first to the sixth of the month, the former took leave of the latter, and proceeded on his journey to Calcutta. Here, then, my Lords, we detect a subterfuge artfully contrived to draw you into a false conclusion! There is also another part of the witness's evidence which is entitled to as little credit. He has sworn that *he knew nothing of the Persian affidavits having been translated.* Now, my Lords, we formerly produced a letter from Major William Davy, the confidential secretary and Persian translator to the governor-general, in which he states that he made an affidavit before Sir Elijah Impey at Buxar on the 12th of December, just six days after Sir Elijah parted from Mr Hastings, swearing that the papers annexed to the affidavits were *faithful translations of the Persian affidavits!* What shall we say, my Lords, of such testimony? I will make only one remark upon it, which I shall borrow from an illustrious man: "That no one could tell where to look for truth, if it could not be found on the *judgment seat*, or know what to credit, if the affirmation of a *judge* was not to be trusted."

I have, my Lords, before observed, that the chief justice was entrusted by the prisoner to concert with Mr Middleton the means of carrying into execution the order of which he was the bearer from the governor-general to the resident. These orders do not appear anywhere in writing, but your Lordships are acquainted with their purport. The Court must recollect that Mr Middleton was instructed by them to persuade the nabob to propose, as from *himself*, to Mr Hastings, the seizure of the begums' treasures. That this was really so appears undeniably as well from the tenor of Mr Middleton's letter on the subject, as from the prisoner's account of the business in his defence. Evidently, Mr Hastings was on this occasion hobbled by difficulties which put all his ingenuity into requisition. He was aware that it must seem extraordinary that at the very moment he was confiscating the property of the begums, on the plea of their treasonable machinations, he should stipulate that an annual allowance equal almost to the produce of that property should be secured to them. Though he had accused the princesses of rebellion, by which, of course, their treasures were forfeited to the State, yet he was reluctant to appear as the principal in seizing them.

Do not, my Lords, these embarrassments prove that the prisoner was sensible of the injustice of his proceedings? *If the princesses were in rebellion, there could be no ground for his demurring to seize their property.* The consciousness of their innocence could alone, therefore, make him timid and irresolute. To get rid at once of his difficulties, he resorts to the expedient which I have before stated, namely, of giving directions to Sir Elijah Impey that Mr Middleton should urge the nabob to propose, as from himself, the seizure of the treasures. My Lords, the unhappy prince, without a will of his own, consented to make the proposal, as an alternative for the resumption of the *jaghires;* a measure to which he had the most unconquerable reluctance. Mr Hastings, as it were to indulge the nabob, agreed to the proposal; rejoicing, at the same time, that his scheme had proved so far successful; for he thought this proposal, coming from the nabob, would free him from the odium of so unpopular a plundering. But the artifice was too shallow; and your Lordships are now able to trace the measure to its source. The Court will see from the evidence that Mr Hastings suggested it to Sir Elijah Impey, that Sir Elijah Impey might suggest it to Middleton, that Middleton might suggest it to the nabob, *that his Highness might suggest it to Mr Hastings;* and thus the suggestion returned to the place from which it had originally set out!

One single passage of a letter, written by Middleton to Mr Hastings on the 2d of December 1781, will make this point as clear as day. He informs the governor-general that "the nabob, wishing to evade the measure of resuming the *jaghires*, had sent him a message to the following purport: that if the measure proposed was intended to procure the payment of the balance due to the Company, he could better and more expeditiously effect that object by taking from his mother the treasures of his father, which he asserted to be in her hands, and to which he claimed a right, founded on the laws of the Koran; and that it would be sufficient that he [Mr Hastings] would hint his opinion upon it, *without giving a formal sanction* to the measure proposed." Mr Middleton added, "the resumption of the *jaghires* it is

necessary to suspend till I have your answer to this letter."

In the first place, it is clear from this letter that, though the nabob consented to make the desired proposal for seizing the treasures, it was only as an alternative; for it never entered into his head both to seize the treasures and resume the *jaghires*. The former measure he wished to substitute in the room of the latter, and by no means to couple them together. But Mr Hastings was too nice a reasoner for the prince. He insisted that one measure should be carried into execution, because the nabob had proposed it; and the other, because he himself determined upon it.

It also appears that the nabob was *taught* to plead his right to the treasures, as founded upon the laws of the Koran. Not a word was said about the guarantee and treaty which had *barred* that right, whatever it might have been! But, my Lords, if all Mr Hastings would have the world believe is true, he [the nabob] had still a much better title—one against which the treaty and guarantee could not be raised, and this was the *treason* of the begums, by which they forfeited all their property to the State, and every claim upon English protection. On this right by forfeiture, the nabob, however, was silent. Being a stranger to the rebellion, and to the treason of his parents, he was reduced to the necessity of reviving a right under the laws of the Koran, which the treaty and guarantee had for ever extinguished.

This letter, moreover, contains this remarkable expression, namely, "that it would be sufficient to hint his [Mr Hastings'] *opinion upon it, without giving a formal sanction to the measure proposed.*" Why this caution? If the begums were guilty of treason, why should he be fearful of declaring to the world that it was not the practice of the English to protect rebellious subjects, and prevent their injured sovereigns from proceeding against them according to law?—that he considered the treaty and guarantee, by which the begums held their property, as no longer binding upon the English Government, who consequently could have no further right to interfere between the nabob and his rebellious parents, but must leave him at liberty to punish or forgive them as he should think fit? But, my Lords, instead of holding this language, which manliness and conscious integrity would have dictated, had he been convinced of the guilt of the begums, Mr Hastings wished to derive all possible advantage from *active* measures against them, and at the same time so far to save appearances, as that he might be thought to be *passive* in the affair.

My Lords, in another part of the same letter, Mr Middleton informs the governor-general "that he sent him, at the same time, a letter from the nabob on the subject of seizing the treasures." This letter has been suppressed. I challenge the counsel for the prisoner to produce it, or to account satisfactorily to your Lordships for its not having been entered upon the Company's records. Nor is this, my Lords, the only suppression of which we have reason to complain. The affidavit of Goulass Roy, who lived at Fyzabad, the residence of the begums, and who was known to be their enemy, is also suppressed. No person could be so well informed of their guilt, if they had been guilty, as Goulass Roy, who resided upon the spot where levies were said to have been made for Cheyte Sing by their order. If, therefore, his testimony had not destroyed the charge of a rebellion on the part of the begums, there is no doubt but it would have been carefully preserved. The information of Mr Scott has, moreover, been withheld from us. This gentleman lived unmolested at Taunda, where Sumshire Khan commanded for the begums, and where he carried on an extensive manufacture without the least hindrance from this supposed disaffected governor. Mr Scott was at Taunda too when it was said that the governor pointed the guns of the fort upon Captain Gordon's party. If this circumstance, my Lords, did really happen, Mr Scott must have heard of it, as he was himself at the time under the protection of those very guns. Why, then, is not the examination of this gentleman produced? I believe your Lordships are satisfied that, if it had supported the allegations against Sumshire Khan, it would not have been cancelled.

It is not clear to me, my Lords, that, as servile a tool as Mr Middleton was, the prisoner entrusted him with *every* part of his intentions throughout the business of the begums. He certainly mistrusted, or pretended to mistrust him, in his proceedings relative to the resumption of the *jaghires*. When it began to be rumoured abroad that terms so favourable to the nabob as he obtained in the treaty of Chunar—by which Mr Hastings consented to withdraw the temporary brigade, and to remove the English gentlemen from Oude—would never have been granted, if the nabob had not bribed the parties concerned in the negotiation to betray the interests of the Company, Mr Hastings *confirmed* the report by actually charging Mr Middleton and his assistant resident, Mr Johnson, with having accepted of bribes. They both joined in the most solemn assurances of their innocence, and called God to witness the truth of their declarations. Mr Hastings, after this, appeared satisfied; possibly the consciousness that he had in his own pocket the only bribe which was given on the occasion, the £100,000, might have made him the less earnest in prosecuting any further inquiry into the business.

A passage in a letter from Mr Hastings shows that he did not think proper to commit to writing all the orders which he wished Mr Middleton to execute; for there Mr Hastings expresses his

doubts of the resident's "firmness and activity; and, above all, of his *recollection* of his instructions and their importance; and said, that if he, Mr Middleton, could not rely on his own power, and the means he possessed for performing those services, he would *free him from the charge*, and proceed to Lucknow and undertake it himself." My Lords, you must presume that the instructions here alluded to were *verbal;* for had they been written, there could be no danger of their being forgot. I call upon the counsel to state the nature of those instructions, which were deemed of so much importance, that the governor was so greatly afraid Mr Middleton would not recollect them, and which, nevertheless, *he did not dare to commit to writing.*

To make your Lordships understand some other expressions in the above passage, I must recall to your memory, that it has appeared in evidence that Mr Middleton had a strong objection to the resumption of the *jaghires;* which he thought a service of so much danger, that he removed Mrs Middleton and his family when he was about to enter upon it; for he expected resistance not only from the begums, but from the nabob's own aumeels [agents]; who, knowing that the prince was a reluctant instrument in the hands of the English, thought they would please him by opposing a measure to which he had given his authority *against his will.* Middleton undoubtedly expected the whole country would unanimously rise against him; and therefore it was, my Lords, that he suspended the execution of the order of resumption, until he should find whether the seizure of the treasures, proposed *as an alternative*, would be accepted *as such.* The prisoner pressed him to execute the order for resuming the *jaghires*, and offered to go himself upon that service if he should decline it. Middleton at last, having received a thundering letter from Mr Hastings, by which he left him to act under "a dreadful responsibility," set out for Fyzabad.

My Lords, for all the cruelties and barbarities that were executed there, the governor-general in his narrative says, he does not hold himself answerable, because he commanded Middleton to be personally present during the whole of the transaction, until he should complete the seizing of the treasures and resuming the *jaghires.* But for what purpose did he order Middleton to be present? I will show, by quoting the orders verbatim: "You yourself must be personally present; you must not allow any negotiation or forbearance, but must prosecute both services, until the begums are at the entire mercy of the nabob." These peremptory orders, given under "a dreadful responsibility," were not issued, my Lords, as you see, for purposes of *humanity;* not that the presence of the resident might restrain the violence of the soldier; but that he might be *a watch upon the nabob*, to steel his heart against the feelings of returning nature in his breast, and prevent the possibility of his relenting, or granting any terms to his mother and grandmother. This, truly, was the abominable motive which induced the prisoner to command the personal attendance of Middleton, and yet, my Lords, he dares to say that he is not responsible for the horrid scene which ensued.

[Here Mr Sheridan was taken ill, and retired for a while to try if in the fresh air he could recover, so as that he might conclude all he had to say upon the evidence on the second charge. Some time after, Mr Fox informed their Lordships that Mr Sheridan was much better, but that he felt he was not sufficiently so to be able to do justice to the subject he had in hand. The managers therefore hoped their Lordships would be pleased to appoint a future day, on which Mr Sheridan would finish his observations on the evidence.

Upon this, their Lordships returned to their own House, and adjourned the Court.]

My Lords, permit me to remind you, that when I had last the honour of addressing you, I concluded with submitting to the Court the whole of the correspondence, as far as it could be obtained, between the principal and agents in the nefarious plot carried on against the nabob vizier and the begums of Oude. These letters demand of the Court the most grave and deliberate attention, as containing not only a narrative of that foul and unmanly conspiracy, but also a detail of the motives and ends for which it was formed, and an exposition of the trick and quibble, the prevarication and the untruth with which it was then acted, and is now attempted to be defended. It will here be naturally inquired, with some degree of surprise, how the private correspondence which thus establishes the guilt of its authors came to light? This was owing to a mutual resentment which broke out about the middle of December 1782, between the parties. Mr Middleton, on the one hand, became jealous of the abatement of Mr Hastings' confidence; and the governor-general was incensed at the tardiness with which the resident proceeded.

From this moment, shyness and suspicion between the principal and the agent took place. Middleton hesitated about the expediency of resuming the *jaghires*, and began to doubt whether the advantage would be equal to the risk. Mr Hastings, whether he apprehended that Middleton was retarded by any return of humanity or sentiments of justice, by any secret combination with the begum and her son, or a wish to take the *lion's share* of the plunder to himself, was exasperated at the delay. Middleton represented the unwillingness of the nabob to execute the measure—the low state of his finances—that his troops were mutinous for want of pay—that his life had been in danger from an insurrection among them--and that in

this moment of distress he had offered £100,000, in addition to a like sum paid before, as an equivalent for the resumption which was demanded of him. Of this offer, however, it now appears, *the nabob knew nothing!* In conferring an obligation, my Lords, it is sometimes contrived, from motives of delicacy, that the name of the donor shall be concealed from the person obliged; but here it was reserved for Middleton to refine this sentiment of delicacy, so as to leave the person *giving utterly ignorant of the favour he bestowed!*

But notwithstanding these little differences and suspicions, Mr Hastings and Mr Middleton, on the return of the latter to Calcutta in October 1782, lived in the same style of friendly collusion and fraudulent familiarity as formerly. After, however, an intimacy of about six months, the governor-general very unexpectedly arraigns his friend before the Board at Calcutta. It was on this occasion that the prisoner, rashly for himself, but happily for the purposes of justice, produced these letters. Whatever, my Lords, was the meaning of this proceeding—whether it was a juggle to elude inquiry, or whether it was intended to make an impression at Fyzabad—whether Mr Hastings drew up the charge, and instructed Mr Middleton how to prepare the defence; or whether the accused composed the charge, and the accuser the defence, there is discernible in the transaction the same habitual collusion in which the parties lived, and the prosecution ended, as we have seen, in a rhapsody, a repartee, and a poetical quotation by the prosecutor!

The *private letters*, my Lords, are the only part of the correspondence thus providentially disclosed, which is deserving of attention. They were written in the confidence of private communication, without any motives to palliate and colour facts, or to mislead. The counsel for the prisoner have, however, chosen to rely on the *public* correspondence, prepared, as appears on the very face of it, for the concealment of fraud and the purpose of deception. They, for example, dwelt on a letter from Mr Middleton, dated December 1781, which intimates some supposed contumacy of the begums; and this they thought countenanced the proceedings which afterward took place, and particularly the resumption of the *jaghires;* but, my Lords, you cannot have forgotten, that both Sir Elijah Impey and Mr Middleton declared, in their examination at your bar, that the letter was totally false. Another letter, which mentions "the determination of the nabob to resume the *jaghires*," was also dwelt upon with great emphasis; but it is in evidence that the nabob, on the contrary, could not, by any means, be induced to sanction the measure; that it was not indeed, till Mr Middleton had actually issued his own *Perwannas* [warrants] for the collection of the rents, that the prince, to avoid a state of the lowest degradation, consented to give it the appearance of his act.

In the same letter, the resistance of the begums to the seizure of their treasures is noticed as an instance of *female levity*, as if their defence of the property assigned for their subsistence was a matter of censure, or that they merited a reproof for feminine lightness, because they urged an objection to being *starved!*

The opposition, in short, my Lords, which *was expected* from the princesses, was looked to as a justification of the proceedings which afterward happened. There is not, in the *private* letters, the slightest intimation of the anterior rebellion, which by prudent *after-thought* was so greatly magnified. There is not a syllable of those dangerous machinations which were to dethrone the nabob, nor of those sanguinary artifices by which the English were to be extirpated. It is indeed said, that if such measures were rigorously pursued, as had been set on foot, the people might be driven from murmurs to resistance, and rise up in arms against their oppressors.

Where then, my Lords, is the proof of this mighty rebellion? It is contained alone, where it is natural to expect it, in the *fabricated* correspondence between Middleton and Hastings, and in the affidavits collected by Sir Elijah Impey!

The gravity of the business on which the chief justice was employed on this occasion contrasted with the vivacity, the rapidity, and celerity of his movements, is exceedingly curious. At one moment he appeared in Oude, at another in Chunar, at a third in Benares, procuring testimony, and in every quarter exclaiming like Hamlet's Ghost, "SWEAR!" To him might also have been applied the words of Hamlet to the Ghost, "What, Truepenny! are you there?" * But the similitude goes no further. He was never heard to give the injunction:

> "Taint not thy mind, nor let thy soul contrive
> Against thy *mother* aught!" †

V. It is, my Lords, in some degree worthy of your observation, that not one of the private letters of Mr Hastings has at any time been disclosed. Even Middleton, when all confidence was broken between them by the production of his private correspondence at Calcutta, either feeling for his own safety, or sunk under the fascinating influence of his master, did not dare attempt a retaliation! The letters of Middleton, however, are sufficient to prove the situation of

* "*Ghost* (from beneath the stage). SWEAR!
Hamlet. Ah ha, boy, say'st thou so? Art thou there, Truepenny?"—*Shakespeare's Hamlet*, i. 5.

† This is the instruction of the Ghost to Hamlet:
"But howsoever thou pursuest this act,
Taint not thy mind, nor let thy soul contrive
Against thy mother aught. Leave that to Heaven!"
—*Hamlet*, i. 5.

the nabob, when pressed to the resumption of the *jaghires*. He is there described as being sometimes lost in sullen melancholy—at others, agitated beyond expression, exhibiting every mark of agonised sensibility. Even Middleton was moved by his distresses to interfere for a temporary respite, in which he might become more reconciled to the measure. "I am fully of opinion," said he, "that the despair of the nabob must impel him to violence. I know, also, that the violence must be fatal to himself; but yet I think, that with his present feelings, he will disregard all consequences."

Mr Johnson, the assistant resident, also wrote to the same purpose. The words of his letter are memorable. "He thought it would require a *campaign* to execute the orders for the resumption of the *jaghires!*" A campaign against whom? Against the nabob, our friend and ally, who had *voluntarily* given the order!! This measure, then, which we have heard contended was for his good and the good of his country, could truly be only enforced by a campaign! Such is British justice! such is British humanity! Mr Hastings guarantees to the allies of the Company their prosperity and his protection. The former he secures by sending an army to plunder them of their wealth and to desolate their soil. The latter produces the misery and the ruin of the protected. His is the protection which the vulture gives to the lamb, which covers while it devours its prey; which stretching its baleful pinions and hovering in mid air, disperses the kites and lesser birds of prey, and saves the innocent and helpless victim from all talons but its own.

It is curious, my Lords, to remark, that in the correspondence of these creatures of Mr Hastings, and in their earnest endeavours to dissuade him from the resumption of the *jaghires*, not a word is mentioned of the measure being contrary to honour—to faith; derogatory to national character; unmanly or unprincipled. Knowing the man to whom they were writing, their only arguments were, that it was contrary to *policy* and to *expediency*. Not one word do they mention of the just claims which the nabob had to the gratitude and friendship of the English. Not one syllable of the treaty by which we were bound to protect him. Not one syllable of the relation which subsisted between him and the princesses they were about to plunder. Not one syllable is hinted of justice or mercy. All which they addressed to him was the apprehension that the money to be procured would not be worth the danger and labour with which it must be attended. There is nothing, my Lords, to be found in the history of human turpitude; nothing in the nervous delineations and penetrating brevity of Tacitus; nothing in the luminous and luxuriant pages of Gibbon, or of any other historian, dead or living, who, searching into measures and characters with the rigour of truth, presents to our abhorrence depravity in its blackest shapes, which can equal, in the grossness of the guilt, or in the hardness of heart with which it was conducted, or in low and grovelling motives, the acts and character of the prisoner.* It was he who, in the base desire of stripping two helpless women, could stir the son to rise up in vengeance against them; who, when that son had certain touches of nature in his breast, certain feelings of an awakened conscience, could accuse him of entertaining peevish objections to the plunder and sacrifice of his mother; who, having finally divested him of all thought, all reflection, all memory, all conscience, all tenderness and duty as a son, all dignity as a monarch; having destroyed his character and depopulated his country, at length brought him to violate the dearest ties of nature, in countenancing the destruction of his parents. This crime, I say, has no parallel or prototype in the Old World or the New, from the day of original sin to the present hour. The victims of his oppression were confessedly destitute of all power to resist their oppressors. But their debility, which from other bosoms would have claimed some compassion, at least with respect to the mode of suffering, with him only excited the ingenuity of torture. Even when every feeling of the nabob was subdued; when, as we have seen, my Lords, nature made a last, lingering, feeble stand within his breast; even then, that cold spirit of malignity, with which his doom was fixed, returned with double rigour and sharper acrimony to its purpose, and compelled the child to inflict on the parent that destruction of which he was himself reserved to be the final victim.

Great as this climax, in which, my Lords, I thought the pinnacle of guilt was attained, there is yet something still more transcendently flagitious. I particularly allude to his [Hastings'] infamous letter, falsely dated the 15th of February 1782, in which, at the very moment that he had given the order for the entire destruction of the begums, and for the resumption of the *jaghires*, he expresses to the nabob the warm and lively interest which he took in his welfare; the sincerity and ardour of his friendship; and that, though his presence was eminently wanted at Calcutta, he could not refrain from coming to his assistance, and that in the meantime he had sent four regiments to his aid; so deliberate and

* "Before my departure from England," says Gibbon in his memoir of himself, "I was present at the august spectacle of Mr Hastings' trial in Westminster Hall. It is not my province to absolve or condemn the Governor of India, but Mr Sheridan's eloquence demanded my applause; nor could I hear without emotion the personal compliment which he paid me in the presence of the British nation." Sheridan on being quizzed by a Whig friend on the utterance of this compliment and the epithet of "luminous," which he applied to Gibbon, who was a Tory, instantly replied, in a half-whisper, "I said voluminous."

cool, so hypocritical and insinuating, is the villainy of this man! What heart is not exasperated by the malignity of a treachery so barefaced and dispassionate? At length, however, the nabob was on his guard. He could not be deceived by this mask. The offer of the four regiments developed to him the object of Mr Hastings. He perceived the dagger bunglingly concealed in the hand, which was treacherously extended as if to his assistance. From this moment the last faint ray of hope expired in his bosom. We accordingly find no further confidence of the nabob in the prisoner. Mr Middleton now swayed his iron sceptre without control. The *jaghires* were seized. Every measure was carried. The nabob, mortified, humbled, and degraded, sunk into insignificance and contempt. This letter was sent at the very time when the troops surrounded the walls of Fyzabad; and then began a scene of horrors, which, if I wished to inflame your Lordships' feelings, I should only have occasion minutely to describe—to state the violence committed on that palace which the piety of the kingdom had raised for the retreat and seclusion of the objects of its pride and veneration! It was in these shades, rendered sacred by superstition, that innocence reposed. Here venerable age and helpless infancy found an asylum! If we look, my Lords, into the whole of this most wicked transaction, from the time when this treachery was first conceived, to that when, by a series of artifices the most execrable, it was brought to a completion, the prisoner will be seen standing aloof, indeed, but not inactive. He will be discovered reviewing his agents, rebuking at one time the pale conscience of Middleton, at another relying on the stouter villainy of Hyder Beg Cawn. With all the calmness of veteran delinquency, his eye will be seen ranging through the busy prospect, piercing the darkness of subordinate guilt, and disciplining with congenial adroitness the agents of his crimes and the instruments of his cruelty.

The feelings, my Lords, of the several parties at the time will be most properly judged of by their respective correspondence. When the bow [younger] begum, despairing of redress from the nabob, addressed herself to Mr Middleton, and reminded him of the guarantee which he had signed, she was instantly promised that the amount of her *jaghire* should be made good, though he said he could not interfere with the sovereign decision of the nabob respecting the lands. The deluded and unfortunate woman "thanked God that Mr Middleton was at hand for her relief." At this very instant he was directing every effort to her destruction; for he had actually written the orders which were to take the collection out of the hands of her agents! But let it not be forgotten, my Lords, when the begum was undeceived—when she found that British faith was no protection—when she found that she should leave the country, and prayed to the God of nations not to grant His peace to those who remained behind—there was still no charge of rebellion, no recrimination made to all her reproaches for the broken faith of the English; that, when stung to madness, she asked "how long would be her reign," there was no mention of her disaffection. The stress is therefore idle, which the counsel for the prisoner have strove to lay on these expressions of an injured and enraged woman. When, at last, irritated beyond bearing, she denounced infamy on the heads of her oppressors, who is there that will not say that she spoke in a *prophetic* spirit; and that what she then predicted has not, even to its last letter, been accomplished! But did Mr Middleton, even to this violence, retort any particle of accusation? No! he sent a *jocose* reply, stating that he had received such a letter under her seal, but that from its contents, he could not suspect it to come from her; and begged therefore that she would endeavour to detect the *forgery!* Thus did he add to foul injuries the vile aggravation of a *brutal jest.* Like the tiger he showed the savageness of his nature by grinning at his prey, and fawning over the last agonies of his unfortunate victim!

The letters, my Lords, were then enclosed to the nabob, who, no more than the rest, made any attempt to justify himself by imputing any criminality to the begums. He only sighed a hope that his conduct to his parents had drawn no shame upon his head; and declared his intention to punish, not any disaffection in the begums, but some officious servants who had dared to foment the misunderstanding between them and himself. A letter was finally sent to Mr Hastings, about six days before the seizure of the treasures from the begums, declaring their innocence; and referring the governor-general, in proof of it, to Captain Gordon, whose life they had protected, and whose safety should have been their justification. This inquiry was never made. It was looked on as unnecessary, because the conviction of their innocence was too deeply impressed already.

The counsel, my Lords, in recommending an attention to the public in reference to the private letters, remarked particularly that one of the latter should not be taken in evidence, because it was evidently and abstractedly private, relating the anxieties of Mr Middleton on account of the illness of his son. This is a singular argument indeed. The circumstance, however, undoubtedly merits strict observation, though not in the view in which it was placed by the counsel. It goes to show, that some, at least, of the persons concerned in these transactions felt the force of those ties which their efforts were directed to tear asunder; that those who could ridicule the respective attachment of a mother and a son; who could prohibit the reverence of the son to the mother; who could deny to maternal debility the protection which filial

tenderness should afford, were yet sensible of the straining of those chords by which they are connected. There is something in the present business, with all that is horrible to create aversion, so vilely loathsome, as to excite disgust. It is, my Lords, surely superfluous to dwell on the sacredness of the ties which those aliens to feeling, those apostates to humanity, thus divided. In such an assembly as the one before which I speak, there is not an eye but must look reproof to this conduct, not a heart but must anticipate its condemnation. *Filial piety!* It is the primal bond of society. It is that instinctive principle which, panting for its proper good, soothes, unbidden, each sense and sensibility of man. It now quivers on every lip. It now beams from every eye. It is that gratitude which, softening under the sense of recollected good, is eager to own the vast, countless debt it never, alas! can pay, for so many long years of unceasing solicitudes, honourable self-denials, life-preserving cares. It is that part of our practice where duty drops its awe, where reverence refines into love. It asks no aid of memory. It needs not the deductions of reason. Pre-existing, paramount over all, whether moral law or human rule, few arguments can increase, and none can diminish it. It is the sacrament of our nature; not only the duty, but the indulgence of man. It is the first great privilege. It is among his last most endearing delights. It causes the bosom to glow with reverberated love. It requites the visitations of nature, and returns the blessings that have been received. It fires the blessings that have been received. It changes what was instinct into a master passion; sways all the sweetest energies of man; hangs over each vicissitude of all that must pass away; and aids the melancholy virtues in their last sad tasks of life, to cheer the languors of decrepitude and age, and

"Explore the thought, explain the aching eye!" *

But, my Lords, I am ashamed to consume so much of your Lordships' time in attempting to give a cold picture of this sacred impulse, when I behold so many breathing testimonies of its influence around me; when every countenance in this assembly is beaming, and erecting itself into the recognition of this universal principle!

The expressions contained in the letter of Mr Middleton, of tender solicitude for his son, have been also mentioned, as a proof of the amiableness of his affections. I confess that they do not tend to raise his character in my estimation. Is it not rather an aggravation of his guilt, that he, who thus felt the anxieties of a parent, and who, consequently, must be sensible of the reciprocal feelings of a child, could be brought to tear asunder, and violate in others, all those dear and sacred bonds? Does it not enhance the turpitude of the transaction, that it was not the result of idiotic ignorance or brutal indifference? I aver that his guilt is increased and magnified by these considerations. His criminality would have been less had he been insensible to tenderness—less, if he had not been so thoroughly acquainted with the true quality of paternal love and filial duty.

The *jaghires* being seized, my Lords, the begums were left without the smallest share of that pecuniary compensation promised by Mr Middleton as an equivalent for the resumption. And as tyranny and injustice, when they take the field, are always attended by their camp followers, paltry pilfering and petty insult, so in this instance, the goods taken from the princesses were sold at a mock sale at an inferior value. Even gold and jewels, to use the language of the begums, instantly lost their value when it was known that they came from them. Their ministers were imprisoned, to extort the deficiency which this fraud occasioned; and every mean art was employed to justify a continuance of cruelty toward them. Yet this was small to the frauds of Mr Hastings. After extorting upward of £600,000, he forbade Mr Middleton to come to a *conclusive settlement* with the princesses. He knew that the treasons of our allies in India had their origin solely in the wants of the Company. He could not, therefore, say that the begums were entirely innocent, until he had consulted the General Record of Crimes, *the Cash Account of Calcutta!* His prudence was fully justified by the event; for there was actually found a balance of *twenty-six lacs* more against the begums, which £260,000 worth of treason had never been dreamed of before. "Talk not to us," said the governor-general, "of their guilt or innocence, but as it suits the Company's *credit!* We will not try them by the Code of Justinian, nor the Institutes of Timur. We will not judge them either by British laws, or their local customs! No! we will try them by the *Multiplication Table;* we will find the guilty by the *Rule of Three;* and we will condemn them according to the unerring rules of—COCKER'S *Arithmetic!*"

My Lords, the prisoner has said in his defence, that the cruelties exercised toward the begums were not of his order. But in another part of it he avows, "that whatever were their distresses, and whoever was the agent in the measure, it was, in his opinion, reconcilable to justice, honour, and sound policy." By the testimony of Major Scott, it appears, that though the defence of the prisoner was not drawn up by himself, yet that this paragraph he wrote with his *own*

---

* Really "asking eye" in the original:

"Me, let the tender office long engage
To rock the cradle of reposing age,
With lenient arts extend a mother's breath,
Make languor smile, and smooth the bed of death;
Explore the thought, explain the *asking* eye,
And keep a while one parent from the sky!"
—*Pope's Epistle to Dr Arbuthnot.*

proper hand. Middleton, it seems, had confessed his share in these transactions with some degree of compunction, and solicitude as to the consequences. The prisoner observing it, cries out to him: "Give me the pen; I will defend the measure as just and necessary. I will take something upon myself. Whatever part of the load you cannot bear, my *unburdened* character shall assume! Your conduct I will crown with my irresistible approbation. Do you find *memory* and I will find *character*, and thus twin warriors we will go into the field, each in his proper sphere of action, and assault, repulse, and contumely shall all be set at defiance."

If I could not prove, my Lords, that those acts of Mr Middleton were in reality the acts of Mr Hastings, I should not trouble your Lordships by combating them; but as this part of his criminality can be incontestably ascertained, I appeal to the assembled legislators of this realm to say whether these acts were justifiable on the score of *policy*. I appeal to all the august presidents in the courts of British justice, and to all the learned ornaments of the profession, to decide whether these acts were reconcilable to *justice*. I appeal to the reverend assemblage of prelates feeling for the general interests of humanity and for the honour of the religion to which they belong, to determine whether these acts of Mr Hastings and Mr Middleton were such as a Christian ought to perform, or a man to avow.

My Lords, with the ministers of the nabob [Bahar Ally Cawn and Jewar Ally Cawn] was confined in the same prison that arch-rebel Sumshire Khan, against whom so much criminality has been charged by the counsel for the prisoner. We hear, however, of no inquiry having been made concerning his treason, though so many were held respecting the *treasures* of the others. With all his guilt, he was not so far noticed as to be deprived of his *food*, to be complimented with *fetters*, or even to have the satisfaction of being *scourged*, but was *cruelly* liberated from a dungeon, and *ignominiously* let loose on his parole!

[Here Mr Sheridan read the following order from Mr Middleton to Lieutenant Rutledge in relation to the begums' ministers, dated 28th January 1782:

"SIR,—When this note is delivered to you by Hoolas Roy, I have to desire that you order the two prisoners to be put *in irons, keeping them from all food, etc., agreeably to my instructions of yesterday.* NATH. MIDDLETON."]

The begums' ministers, on the contrary, to extort from them the disclosure of the place which concealed the treasures, were, according to the evidence of Mr Holt, after being fettered and imprisoned, led out on a scaffold, and this array of terrors proving unavailing, the *meek-tempered* Middleton, as a *dernier ressort*, menaced them with a confinement in the fortress of Chunargar. Thus, my Lords, was a British garrison made the *climax of cruelties!* To English arms, to English officers, around whose banners humanity has ever entwined her most glorious wreath, how will this sound? It was in this fort, where the British flag was flying, that these helpless prisoners were doomed to deeper dungeons, heavier chains, and severer punishments. Where that flag was displayed which was wont to cheer the depressed, and to dilate the subdued heart of misery, these venerable but unfortunate men were fated to encounter every aggravation of horror and distress. It, moreover, appears that they were both cruelly flogged, though one was above seventy years of age. Being charged with disaffection, they vindicated their innocence—"Tell us where are the remaining treasures," was the reply. "It is only treachery to your immediate sovereigns, and you will then be fit associates for the representatives of British faith and British justice in India!" O Faith! O Justice! I conjure you by your sacred names to depart for a moment from this place, though it be your peculiar residence; nor hear your names profaned by such a sacrilegious combination as that which I am now compelled to repeat—where all the fair forms of nature and art, truth and peace, policy and honour, shrink back aghast from the deleterious shade—where all existences, nefarious and vile, have sway—where, amid the black agents on one side and Middleton with Impey on the other, the great figure of the piece—characteristic in his place, aloof and independent from the puny profligacy in his train, but far from idle and inactive, turning a malignant eye on all mischief that awaits him; the multiplied apparatus of temporising expedients and intimidating instruments, now cringing on his prey, and fawning on his vengeance—now quickening the limping pace of craft, and forcing every stand that retiring nature can make to the heart; the attachments and the decorums of life; each emotion of tenderness and honour; and all the distinctions of national pride; with a long catalogue of crimes and aggravations beyond the reach of thought for human malignity to perpetrate or human vengeance to punish; *lower* than *perdition—blacker* than *despair!*

It might, my Lords, have been hoped, for the honour of the human heart, that the begums were themselves exempted from a share in these sufferings, and that they had been wounded only through the sides of their ministers. The reverse of this, however, is the fact. Their palace was surrounded by a guard, which was withdrawn by Major Gilpin to avoid the growing resentments of the people, and replaced by Mr Middleton, through his fears of that "dreadful responsibility" which was imposed upon him by Mr Hastings. The women, also, of the khord mahal, who were not involved in the begums' supposed crimes; who had raised no *sub-rebellion*

of their own; and who, it has been proved, lived in a distinct dwelling, were causelessly implicated, nevertheless, in the same punishment. Their residence surrounded with guards, they were driven to despair by famine, and when they poured forth in sad procession, were beaten with bludgeons, and forced back by the soldiery to the scene of madness which they had quitted. These are acts, my Lords, which, when told, need no comment. I will not offer a single syllable to awaken your Lordships' feelings; but leave it to the facts which have been stated to make their own impression.*

VI. The inquiry which now only remains, my Lords, is, whether Mr Hastings is to be answerable for the crimes committed by his agents? It has been fully proved that Mr Middleton signed the treaty with the superior begum in October 1778. He also acknowledged signing some others of a different date, but could not *recollect* the authority by which he did it! These treaties were recognised by Mr Hastings, as appears by the evidence of Mr Purling, in the year 1780. In that of October 1778, the *jaghire* was secured, which was allotted for the support of the women in the khord mahal. But still the prisoner pleads that he is not accountable for the cruelties which were exercised. His is the plea which tyranny, aided by its prime minister, treachery, is always sure to set up. Mr Middleton has attempted to strengthen this ground by endeavouring to claim tl.e whole infamy in these transactions, and to monopolise the guilt! He dared even to aver, that he had been condemned by Mr Hastings for the ignominious part he had acted. He dared to avow this, because Mr Hastings was on his trial, and he thought he never would be arraigned; but in the face of this Court, and before he left the bar, he was compelled to confess that it was for the *lenience*, and not the *severity* of his proceedings, that he had been reproved by the prisoner.

It will not, I trust, be concluded that because Mr Hastings has not marked every passing shade of guilt, and because he has only given the bold outline of cruelty, he is therefore to be acquitted. It is laid down by the law of England, that law which is the perfection of reason, that a person ordering an act to be done by his agent is answerable for that act with all its consequences, "Quod facit per alium, facit per se." Middleton was appointed, in 1777, the confidential agent, the *second self* of Mr Hastings. The governor-general ordered the measure. Even if he never saw, nor heard afterward of its consequences, he was therefore answerable for every pang that was inflicted, and for all the blood that was shed. But he did hear, and that instantly, of the whole. He wrote to accuse Middleton of forbearance and of neglect! He commanded him to work upon the hopes and fears of the princesses, and to leave no means untried, until, to speak his own language, which was better suited to the banditti of a cavern, "he obtained possession of the secret hoards of the old ladies." He would not allow even of a delay of two days to smooth the compelled approaches of a son to his mother, on this occasion! His orders were peremptory. After this, my Lords, can it be said that the prisoner was ignorant of the acts, or not culpable for their consequences? It is true, he did not direct the guards, the famine, and the bludgeons; he did not weigh the fetters, nor number the lashes to be inflicted on his victims; but yet he is just as guilty as if he had borne an active and personal share in each transaction. It is as if he had commanded that the heart should be torn from the bosom, and enjoined that no blood should follow. He is in the same degree accountable to the *law*, to his *country*, to his *conscience*, and to his GOD!

The prisoner has endeavoured also to get rid of a part of his guilt, by observing that he was but

---

* "The begums gave up the treasures; but the eunuchs were not yet released. More money was absolutely required, and new severities were employed. The sufferings to which they were thus exposed drew from the eunuchs the offer of an engagement for the payment of the demanded sum, which they undertook to complete within the period of one month, from their *own* credit and effects. The engagement was taken, but the confinement of the eunuchs was not relaxed; the mother and grandmother of the nabob remained under guard; and the resident was commanded to make with them *no settlement whatsoever*. The prisoners entreated their release, declaring their inability to procure any further sums of money while they remained in confinement. So far from any relaxation of their sufferings, higher measures of severity were enjoined. After they had lain two months in irons, the commanding officer advised a temporary release from fetters on account of their health, which was rapidly sinking; but the instructions of the resident compelled him to refuse the smallest mitigation of their torture. They were threatened with being removed to Lucknow [to the fortress of Chunargar], where they would only be subjected to severer coercion, unless they performed, without delay, what they averred themselves unable to perform. They were accordingly soon after removed to Lucknow, and cruelties inflicted upon them, of which the nature is not disclosed; of which the following letter, addressed by the assistant resident to the commanding officer of the English guard, is a disgraceful proof: 'Sir,—The nabob having determined to inflict *corporeal punishment* upon the prisoners under your guard, this is to desire that his officers, when they come, may have free access to the prisoners, and be permitted to do with them as they shall see proper.' The women in the zenana, in the meanwhile, were, at various times, deprived of food, till they were on the point of perishing for want. The rigours went on increasing till the month of December [that is, for nearly a year], when the resident, convinced by his own experience, and the representation of the officer commanding the guard by which the princesses were coerced, that everything which force could accomplish was already performed, removed, of his own authority, the guard from the palace of the begums, and set at liberty their ministers."—*Mill's British India*, iv. 396-398.

one of the supreme council, and that all the rest had sanctioned those transactions with their approbation. Even if it were true that others did participate in the guilt, it cannot tend to diminish his criminality. But the fact is, that the council erred in nothing so much as in a reprehensible credulity given to the declarations of the governor-general. They knew not a word of those transactions until they were finally concluded. It was not until the January following that they saw the mass of falsehood which had been published under the title of "Mr Hastings' Narrative." They were, then, unaccountably duped to permit a letter to pass, dated the 29th of November, intended to seduce the directors into a belief that they had received intelligence at that time, which was not the fact. These observations, my Lords, are not meant to cast any obloquy on the council; they undoubtedly were deceived; and the deceit practised on them is a decided proof of his consciousness of guilt. When tired of corporeal infliction, Mr Hastings was gratified by insulting the understanding. The coolness and reflection with which this act was managed and concerted raises its enormity and blackens its turpitude. It proves the prisoner to be that monster in nature, a *deliberate and reasoning tyrant!* Other tyrants of whom we read, such as a Nero, or a Caligula, were urged to their crimes by the impetuosity of passion. High rank disqualified them from advice, and perhaps equally prevented reflection. But in the prisoner we have a man born in a state of mediocrity; bred to mercantile life; used to system; and accustomed to regularity; who was accountable to his masters, and therefore was compelled to think and to deliberate on every part of his conduct. It is this cool deliberation, I say, which renders his crimes more horrible, and his character more atrocious.

When, my Lords, the Board of Directors received the advices which Mr Hastings thought proper to transmit, though unfurnished with any other materials to form their judgment, they expressed very strongly their doubts, and properly ordered an inquiry into the circumstances of the alleged disaffection of the begums, declaring it, at the same time, to be a debt which was due to the honour and justice of the British nation. This inquiry, however, Mr Hastings thought it absolutely necessary to elude. He stated to the council, in answer, "that it would revive those animosities that subsisted between the begums and the nabob [Asoph Dowlah], which had then subsided. If the former were inclined to appeal to a foreign jurisdiction, they were the best judges of their own feeling, and should be left to make their own complaint." All this, however, my Lords, is nothing to the magnificent paragraph which concludes this communication. "Besides," says he, "I hope it will not be a departure from official language to say, that the *majesty of justice* ought not to be approached without solicitation. She ought not to descend to inflame or provoke, but to withhold her judgment until she is called on to determine." What is still more astonishing is, that Sir John Macpherson, who, though a man of sense and honour, is rather Oriental in his imagination, and not learned in the sublime and beautiful from the immortal leader of this prosecution, was caught by this bold, bombastic quibble, and joined in the same words, "That the *majesty of justice* ought not to be approached without solicitation." But, my Lords, do you, the judges of this land, and the expounders of its rightful laws—do you approve of this mockery and call it the character of justice, which takes the *form of right* to excite wrong? No, my Lords, justice is not this halt and miserable object; it is not the ineffective bawble of an Indian pagod; it is not the portentous phantom of despair; it is not like any fabled monster, formed in the eclipse of reason, and found in some unhallowed grove of superstitious darkness and political dismay! No, my Lords. In the happy reverse of all this, I turn from the disgusting caricature to the real image! *Justice* I have now before me august and pure! The abstract idea of all that would be perfect in the spirits and the aspirings of men!—where the mind rises; where the heart expands; where the countenance is ever placid and benign; where her favourite attitude is to stoop to the unfortunate; to hear their cry and to help them; to rescue and relieve, to succour and save; majestic, from its mercy; venerable, from its utility; uplifted, without pride; firm, without obduracy; beneficent in each preference; lovely, though in her frown!

On that justice I rely: deliberate and sure, abstracted from all party purpose and political speculation; not on words, but on facts. You, my Lords, who hear me, I conjure, by those rights which it is your best privilege to preserve; by that fame which it is your best pleasure to inherit; by all those feelings which refer to the first term in the series of existence, the original compact of our nature, our controlling rank in the creation. This is the call on all to administer to truth and equity, as they would satisfy the laws and satisfy themselves, with the most exalted bliss possible or conceivable for our nature; the self-approving consciousness of virtue, when the condemnation we look for will be one of the most ample mercies accomplished for mankind since the creation of the world! My Lords, I have done.

WILLIAM PITT.

1759-1806.

(1782 P 2nd.)

ON THE ABOLITION OF THE SLAVE TRADE.*

[THE question of the abolition of the African slave trade was brought up in the House by William Wilberforce, in a forcible and earnest speech, on the 19th May 1789. Pitt was prepared to take action upon this speech by an immediate vote, but the influence arrayed against this measure prevented him, the Opposition being in favour of protracted inquiry. In May 1792, 517 petitions against the slave trade were laid before Parliament, backed by a motion for its immediate suppression in an able speech by Wilberforce. The speakers who followed were still inclined for delay, and for gradual rather than immediate abolition. Pitt replied in the eloquent speech which follows. Wilberforce made the following entry in his journal regarding the effect of the speech: "Windham, who has no love for Pitt, tells me that Fox and Grey, with whom he walked home from this debate, agreed in thinking Pitt's speech one of the most extraordinary displays of eloquence they had ever heard. For the last twenty minutes he really seemed to be inspired." And Lord Brougham, in his sketch of Pitt in "Statesmen in the time of George III.," says that "all authorities agree in placing his speech on the slave trade . . . before any other effort of his genius; because it combined, with the most impassioned declamation, the deepest pathos, the most lively imagination, and the closest reasoning."]

MR SPEAKER,—At this hour of the morning [four o'clock], I am afraid, sir, I am too much exhausted to enter so fully into the subject before the committe as I could wish; but if my bodily strength is in any degree equal to the task, I feel so strongly the magnitude of this question, that I am extremely earnest to deliver my sentiments, which I rise to do with more satisfaction, because I now look forward to the issue of this business with considerable hope of success.

The debate has this night taken a turn which, though it has produced a variety of new suggestions, has, upon the whole, contracted this question into a much narrower point than it was ever brought into before.

I cannot say that I quite agree with the right honourable gentleman over the way [Mr Fox], for I am far from deploring all that has been said by my two honourable friends [Mr Dundas and Mr Addington]. I rather rejoice that they have now brought this subject to a fair issue; that something, at least, is already gained, and that the question has taken altogether a new course this night. It is true, a difference of opinion has been stated, and has been urged with all the force of argument that could be given to it. But permit me to say that this difference has been urged upon principles very far removed from those which were maintained by the opponents of my honourable friend [Mr Wilberforce], when he first brought forward his motion. There are very few of those who have spoken this night who have not thought it their duty to declare their full and entire concurrence with my honourable friend in promoting the abolition of the slave trade as their ultimate object. However we may differ as to the time and manner of it, we are agreed in the abolition itself; and my honourable friends have expressed their agreement in this sentiment with that sensibility upon the subject which humanity does most undoubtedly require. I do not, however, think they yet perceive what are the necessary consequences of their own concession, or follow up their own principles to their just conclusion.

The point now in dispute between us is a difference merely as to the period of time at which the abolition of the slave trade ought to take place. I therefore congratulate this House, the country, and the world, that this great point is gained. That we may now consider this trade as having received its condemnation; that its sentence is sealed; that this curse of mankind is seen by the House in its true light; and that the greatest stigma on our national character which ever yet existed is about to be removed; and, sir, which is still more important, that mankind, I trust, in general, are now likely to be delivered from *the greatest practical evil that has ever afflicted the human race;* from the severest and most extensive calamity recorded in the history of the world!

In proceeding to give my reasons for concurring with my honourable friend [Mr Wilberforce] in his motion, I shall necessarily advert to those topics which my honourable friends near me [Dundas and Addington] have touched upon, and which they stated to be their motives for preferring a gradual, and, in some degree, a distant abolition of the slave trade, to the more immediate and direct measure now proposed to you. Beginning as I do with declaring that, in this respect, I differ completely from my right honourable friends near me, I do not, however, mean to say that I differ as to one observation which has been pressed rather strongly by them. If

* Delivered in the House of Commons April 2, 1792.

they can show that their proposition of a gradual abolition is more likely than ours to secure the object which we have in view; that by proceeding gradually we shall arrive more speedily at our end, and attain it with more certainty, than by a direct vote immediately to abolish; if they can show to the satisfaction both of myself and the committee, that our proposition has more the *appearance* of a speedy abolition than the *reality* of it, undoubtedly they will in this case make a convert of me and my honourable friend who moved the question. They will make a convert of every man among us who looks to this (which I trust we all do) as a question not to be determined by theoretical principles or enthusiastic feelings, but considers the practicability of the measure, aiming simply to affect his object in the shortest time, and in the surest possible manner. If, however, I shall be able to show that our measure proceeds more directly to its object, and secures it with more certainty, and within a less distant period; and that the slave trade will on our plan be abolished sooner than on theirs, may I not then hope that my right honourable friends will be as ready to adopt our proposition, as we should in the other case be willing to accede to theirs?

One of my right honourable friends has stated that an Act passed here for the abolition of the slave trade would not secure its abolition. Now, sir, I should be glad to know why an Act of the British legislature, enforced by all those sanctions which we have undoubtedly the power and the right to apply, is not to be effectual; at least, as to every material purpose? Will not the executive power have the same appointment of the officers and the courts of judicature, by which all the causes relating to this subject must be tried, that it has in other cases? Will there not be the same system of law by which we now maintain a monopoly of commerce? If the same law, sir, be applied to the prohibition of the slave trade which is applied in the case of other contraband commerce, with all the same means of the country to back it, I am at a loss to know why the actual and total abolition is not as likely to be effected in this way, as by any plan or project of my honourable friends, for bringing about a gradual termination of it. But my observation is extremely fortified by what fell from my honourable friend who spoke last. He has told you, sir, that if you will have patience with it for a few years, the slave trade must drop of itself, from the increasing dearness of the commodity imported, and the increasing progress, on the other hand, of internal population. Is it true, then, that the importations are so expensive and disadvantageous already, that the internal population is even now becoming a cheaper resource? I ask, then, if you leave to the importer no means of importation but by smuggling, and if, besides all the present disadvantages, you load him with all the charges and hazards of the smuggler, by taking care that the laws against smuggling are in this case watchfully and rigorously enforced, is there any danger of any considerable supply of fresh slaves being poured into the islands through this channel? And is there any real ground of fear, because a few slaves may have been smuggled in or out of the islands, that a bill will be useless and ineffectual on any such ground?' The question under these circumstances will not bear a dispute.

I. Perhaps, however, my honourable friends may take up another ground, and say, "It is true your measure would shut out further importations more immediately; but we do not mean to shut them out immediately. We think it right, on grounds of general expediency, that they should not be immediately shut out." Let us therefore now come to this question of the *expediency* of making the abolition distant and gradual, rather than immediate.

The argument of expediency, in my opinion, like every other argument in this disquisition, will not justify the continuance of the slave trade for one unnecessary hour. Supposing it to be in our power, which I have shown it is, to enforce the prohibition from this present time, the expediency of doing it is to me so clear, that if I went on this principle alone, I should not feel a moment's hesitation. What is the argument of expediency stated on the other side? It is doubted whether the deaths and births in the islands are, as yet, so nearly equal as to insure the keeping up a sufficient stock of labourers. In answer to this, I took the liberty of mentioning in a former year what appeared to me to be the state of population at that time. My observations were taken from documents which we have reason to judge authentic, and which carried on the face of them the conclusions I then stated; they were the clear, simple, and obvious result of a careful examination which I made into this subject, and any gentleman who will take the same pains may arrive at the same degree of satisfaction.

These calculations, however, applied to a period of time that is now four or five years past. The births were then, in the general view of them, nearly equal to the deaths; and, as the state of population was shown, by a considerable retrospect, to be regularly increasing, an excess of births must, before this time, have taken place.

Another observation has been made as to the disproportion of the sexes. This, however, is a disparity which existed in any material degree only in former years; it is a disparity of which the slave trade has been itself the cause, which will gradually diminish, as the slave trade diminishes, and must entirely cease if the trade shall be abolished; but which, nevertheless, is made the very plea for its continuance. I believe this disproportion of the sexes, taking the whole number of the islands, Creole as well as imported

Africans, the latter of whom occasion all the disproportion, is not now by any means considerable.

But, sir, I also showed that the great mortality, which turned the balance so as to make the deaths appear more numerous than the births, arose too from the imported Africans, who die in extraordinary numbers in the seasoning. If, therefore, the importation of negroes should cease, every one of the causes of mortality which I have now stated would cease also; nor can I conceive any reason why the present number of labourers should not maintain itself in the West Indies, except it be from some artificial cause, some fault in the islands; such as the impolicy of their governors, or the cruelty of the managers and officers whom they employ. I will not reiterate all that I said at that time, or go through island by island. It is true there is a difference in the ceded islands; and I state them possibly to be, in some respects, an excepted case. But we are not now to enter into the subject of the mortality in clearing new lands. It is, sir, undoubtedly another question; the mortality here is tenfold; neither is it to be considered as the carrying on, but as the setting on foot a slave trade for the purpose of peopling the colony; a measure which I think will not now be maintained. I therefore desire gentlemen to tell me fairly, whether the period they look to is not now arrived; whether, at this hour, the West Indies may not be declared to *have actually attained a state in which they can maintain their population?* And upon the answer I must necessarily receive, I think I could safely rest the whole of the question.

One honourable gentleman has rather ingeniously observed, that one or other of these two assertions of ours must necessarily be false; that either the population must be decreasing, which we deny, or, if the population is increasing, that the slaves must be perfectly well treated (this being the cause of such population), which we deny also. That the population is rather increasing than otherwise, and also that the general treatment is by no means so good as it ought to be, are both points which have been separately proved by different evidences; nor are these two points so entirely incompatible. The ill treatment must be very great, indeed, in order to diminish materially the population of any race of people. That it is not so extremely great as to do this, I will admit. I will even admit, if you please, that this charge may possibly have been sometimes exaggerated; and I certainly think that it applies less and less as we come nearer to the present times.

But let us see how this contradiction of ours, as it is thought, really stands, and how the explanation of it will completely settle our minds on the point in question. Do the slaves diminish in numbers? It can be nothing but ill treatment that causes the diminution. This ill treatment the abolition must and will restrain. In this case, therefore, we ought to vote for the abolition. On the other hand, do you choose to say that the slaves clearly increase in numbers? Then you want no importations, and in this case also you may safely vote for the abolition. Or, if you choose to say, as the third and only other case which can be put, and which perhaps is the nearest to the truth, that the population is nearly stationary, and the treatment neither so bad nor so good as it might be; then surely, sir, it will not be denied that this, of all others, is, on each of the two grounds, the proper period for stopping further supplies; for your population, which you own is already stationary, will thus be made undoubtedly to increase from the births, and the good treatment of your present slaves, which I am now supposing is but very moderate, will be necessarily improved also by the same measure of abolition. I say, therefore, that these propositions, contradictory as they may be represented, are in truth not at all inconsistent, but even come in aid of each other, and lead to a conclusion that is decisive. And let it be always remembered that, in this branch of my argument, I have only in view the well-being of the West Indies, and do not now ground anything on the African part of the question.

But, sir, I may carry these observations respecting the islands much further. It is within the power of the colonists, and it is then their indispensable duty to apply themselves to the correction of those various abuses by which population is restrained. The most important consequences may be expected to attend colonial regulations for this purpose. With the improvement of internal population, the condition of every negro will improve also; his liberty will advance, or at least he will be approaching to a state of liberty. Nor can you increase the happiness, or extend the freedom of the negro, without adding in an equal degree to the safety of the islands, and of all their inhabitants. Thus, sir, in the place of slaves, who naturally have an interest directly opposite to that of their masters, and are therefore viewed by them with an eye of constant suspicion, you will create a body of valuable citizens and subjects, forming a part of the same community, having a common interest with their superiors in the security and prosperity of the whole.

And here let me add, that in proportion as you increase the happiness of these unfortunate beings, you will undoubtedly increase in effect the quantity of their labour also. Gentlemen talk of the diminution of the labour of the islands! I will venture to assert that, even if in consequence of the abolition there were to be some decrease in the number of hands, the quantity of work done, supposing the condition of the slaves to improve, would by no means diminish in the same proportion; perhaps would be far from diminishing at all. For if you

restore to this degraded race the true feelings of men; if you take them out from among the order of brutes, and place them on a level with the rest of the human species, they will then work with that energy which is natural to men, and their labour will be productive, in a thousand ways, above what it has yet been; as the labour of a man is always more productive than that of a mere brute.

It generally happens that in every bad cause information arises out of the evidence of its defenders themselves, which serves to expose in one part or other the weakness of their defence. It is the characteristic of such a cause, that if it be at all gone into, even by its own supporters, it is liable to be ruined by the contradictions in which those who maintain it are for ever involved.

The committee of the Privy Council of Great Britain sent over certain queries to the West India islands, with a view of elucidating the present subject; and they particularly inquired whether the negroes had any days or hours allotted to them in which they might work for themselves. The assemblies in their answers, with an air of great satisfaction, state the labour of the slaves to be moderate, and the West India system to be well calculated to promote the domestic happiness of the slaves. They add, "that proprietors are not compelled by law to allow their slaves any part of the six working days of the week for themselves, but that it is the general practice to allow them one afternoon in every week out of crop time; which, with such hours as they choose to work on Sundays, is time amply sufficient for their own purposes." Now, therefore, will the negroes, or I may rather say, do the negroes work for their own emolument? I beg the committee's attention to this point. The Assembly of Grenada proceeds to state—I have their own words for it, "that though the negroes are allowed the afternoons of only one day in every week, they will do as much work in that afternoon, when employed for their own benefit, as in the whole day when employed in their master's service."

Now, sir, I will desire you to burn all my calculations; to disbelieve, if you please, every word I have said on the present state of population; nay, I will admit, for the sake of argument, that the numbers are decreasing, and the productive labour at present insufficient for the cultivation of those countries; and I will then ask, whether the increase in the *quantity of labour* which is reasonably to be expected from the improved condition of the slaves is not, by the admission of the islands themselves, by their admission not merely of an argument but a fact, far more than sufficient to counterbalance any decrease which can be rationally apprehended from a defective state of their population? Why, sir, a negro, if he works for himself, and not for a master, will do double work! This is their own account. If you will believe the planters, if you will believe the legislature of the islands, the productive labour of the colonies would, in case the negroes worked as free labourers instead of slaves, be literally doubled. Half the present labourers, on this supposition, would suffice for the whole cultivation of our islands on the present scale! I therefore confidently ask the House, whether, in considering the whole of this question, we may not fairly look forward to an improvement in the condition of these unhappy and degraded beings; not only as an event desirable on the ground of humanity and political prudence; but also as a means of increasing, very considerably indeed, even without any increasing population, the productive industry of the islands?

When gentlemen are so nicely balancing the past and future means of cultivating the plantations, let me request them to put this argument into the scale; and the more they consider it, the more will they be satisfied that both the solidity of the principle which I have stated, and the fact which I have just quoted, in the very words of the colonial legislature, will bear me out in every inference I have drawn. I think they will perceive, also, that it is the undeniable duty of this House, on the grounds of true policy, immediately to sanction and carry into effect that system which insures these important advantages; in addition to all those other inestimable blessings which follow in their train.

If, therefore, the argument of expediency, as applying to the West India islands, is the test by which this question is to be tried, I trust I have now established this proposition, namely, that whatever tends most speedily and effectually to meliorate the condition of the slaves, is undoubtedly, on the ground of expediency, leaving justice out of the question, the main object to be pursued.

That the immediate abolition of the slave trade will most eminently have this effect, and that it is the only measure from which this effect can in any considerable degree be expected, are points to which I shall presently come; but before I enter upon them, let me notice one or two further circumstances.

We are told, and by respectable and well-informed persons, that the purchase of new negroes has been injurious instead of profitable to the planters themselves; so large a proportion of these unhappy wretches being found to perish in the seasoning. Writers well versed in this subject have even advised that, in order to remove the temptation which the slave trade offers to expend large sums in this injudicious way, the door of importation should be shut. This very plan we now propose, the mischief of which is represented to be so great as to outweigh so many other momentous considerations,

has actually been recommended by some of the best authorities, as one highly requisite to be adopted on the very principle of advantage to the islands; not merely on that principle of general and political advantage on which I have already touched, but for the advantage of the very individuals who would otherwise be most forward in purchasing slaves. On the part of the West Indies it is urged, "The planters are in debt—they are already distressed; if you stop the slave trade, they will be ruined." Mr Long, the celebrated historian of Jamaica, recommends the stopping of importations, as a receipt for enabling the plantations which are embarrassed to get out of debt. I will quote his words. Speaking of the usurious terms on which money is often borrowed for the purchase of fresh slaves, he advises "the laying a duty equal to a prohibition on all negroes imported for the space of four or five years, except for re-exportation." "Such a law," he proceeds to say, "would be attended with the following good consequences. It would put an immediate stop to these extortions. It would enable the planter to retrieve his affairs by preventing him from running in debt, either by renting or purchasing of negroes. It would render such recruits less necessary, by the redoubled care he would be obliged to take of his present stock, the preservation of their lives and health. And, lastly, it would raise the value of negroes in the island. A North American province, by this prohibition alone for a few years, from being deeply plunged in debt, has become independent, rich, and flourishing." On this authority of Mr Long I rest the question, whether the prohibition of further importations is that rash, impolitic, and completely ruinous measure, which it is so confidently declared to be with respect to our West India plantations.

I do not, however, mean, in thus treating this branch of the subject, absolutely to exclude the question of indemnification on the supposition of possible disadvantages affecting the West Indies through the abolition of the slave trade. But when gentlemen set up a claim of compensation merely on those general allegations, which are all that I have yet heard from them, I can only answer, let them produce their case in a distinct and specific form; and if upon any practicable or reasonable grounds it shall claim consideration, it will then be time enough for Parliament to decide upon it.

I now come to another circumstance of great weight, connected with this part of the question. I mean the danger to which the islands are exposed from those negroes who are newly imported. This, sir, like the observation which I lately made, is no mere speculation of ours; for here, again, I refer you to Mr Long, the historian of Jamaica. He treats particularly of the dangers to be dreaded from the introduction of Coromantine negroes; an appellation under which are comprised several descriptions of Africans obtained on the Gold Coast, whose native country is not exactly known, and who are purchased in a variety of markets, having been brought from some distance inland. With a view of preventing insurrections, he advises that, "by laying a duty equal to a prohibition, no more of these Coromantines should be bought;" and, after noticing one insurrection which happened through their means, he tells you of another in the following year, in which thirty-three Coromantines, most of whom had been newly imported, suddenly rose, and in the space of an hour murdered and wounded no less than nineteen white persons.

To the authority of Mr Long, both in this and other parts of his work, I may add the recorded opinion of the committee of the House of Assembly of Jamaica itself; who, in consequence of a rebellion among the slaves, were appointed to inquire into the best means of preventing future insurrections. The committee reported "that the rebellion had originated (like most or all others) with the Coromantines;" and they proposed that a bill should be brought in "for laying a higher duty on the importation of these particular negroes," which was intended to operate as a prohibition.

But the danger is not confined to the importation of Coromantines. Mr Long, carefully investigating as he does the causes of such frequent insurrections, particularly at Jamaica, accounts for them from the greatness of its general importations. "In two years and a half," says he, "twenty-seven thousand negroes have been imported." "No wonder we have rebellions! Twenty-seven thousand in two years and a half!" Why, sir, I believe that in some late years there have been as many imported into the same island within the same period! Surely, sir, when gentlemen talk so vehemently of the safety of the islands, and charge us with being so indifferent to it; when they speak of the calamities of St Domingo, and of similar dangers impending over their own heads at the present hour, it ill becomes them to be the persons who are crying out for further importations. It ill becomes them to charge upon us the crime of stirring up insurrections—upon us who are only adopting the very principles which Mr Long—which in part even the legislature of Jamaica itself laid down in the time of danger, with an avowed view to the prevention of any such calamity.

The House, I am sure, will easily believe it is no small satisfaction to me, that among the many arguments for prohibiting the slave trade which crowd upon my mind, the security of our West India possessions against internal commotions, as well as foreign enemies, is among the most prominent and most forcible. And here let me apply to my two right honourable friends, and ask them, whether in this part of the argu-

ment they do not see reason for immediate abolition? Why should you any longer import into those countries that which is the very seed of insurrection and rebellion? Why should you persist in introducing those latent principles of conflagration, which, if they should once burst forth, may annihilate in a single day the industry of a hundred years? Why will you subject yourselves, with open eyes, to the evident and imminent risk of a calamity which may throw you back a whole century in your profits, in your cultivation, in your progress to the emancipation of your slaves; and disappointing at once every one of these golden expectations, may retard, not only the accomplishment of that happy system which I have attempted to describe, but may cut off even your opportunity of taking any one introductory step? Let us begin from this time! Let us not commit these important interests to any further hazard! Let us prosecute this great object from this very hour! Let us vote that the abolition of the slave trade shall be immediate, and not left to I know not what future time or contingency! Will my right honourable friends answer for the safety of the islands during any imaginable intervening period? Or do they think that any little advantages of the kind which they state, can have any weight in that scale of expediency in which this great question ought undoubtedly to be tried.

Thus stated, and thus alone, sir, can it be truly stated, to what does the whole of my right honourable friend's argument, on the head of expediency, amount? It amounts but to this: The colonies, on the one hand, would have to struggle with some few difficulties and disadvantages at the first, for the sake of obtaining on the other hand immediate security to their leading interests; of insuring, sir, even their own political existence; and for the sake also of immediately commencing that system of progressive improvement in the condition of slaves, which is necessary to raise them from the state of brutes to that of rational beings, but which never can begin *until the introduction of these new, disaffected, and dangerous Africans into the same gangs shall have been stopped.* If any argument can in the slightest degree justify the severity that is now so generally practised in the treatment of the slaves, it must be the introduction of these Africans. It is the introduction of these Africans that renders all idea of emancipation for the present so chimerical, and the very mention of it so dreadful. It is the introduction of these Africans that keeps down the condition of all plantation negroes. Whatever system of treatment is deemed necessary by the planters to be adopted toward these new Africans, extends itself to the other slaves also; instead, therefore, of deferring the hour when you will finally put an end to importations, vainly purposing that the condition of your present slaves should previously be mended, you must, in the first instance, stop your importations, if you hope to introduce any rational or practicable plan, either of gradual emancipation or present general improvement.

II. Being now done with this question of expediency as affecting the islands, I come next to a proposition advanced by my right honourable friend [Mr Dundas], which appeared to intimate that, on account of some patrimonial rights of the West Indies, the prohibition of the slave trade might be considered as an invasion of their legal inheritance.

Now, in answer to this proposition, I must make two or three remarks, which I think my right honourable friend will find some considerable difficulty in answering.

I observe, then, that his argument, if it be worth anything, applies just as much to gradual as immediate abolition. I have no doubt that, at whatever period he might be disposed to say the abolition should actually take place, this defence will equally be set up; for it certainly is just as good an argument against an abolition seven or seventy years hence, as against an abolition at this moment. It supposes we have no right whatever to stop the importations; and even though the injury to our plantations, which some gentlemen suppose to attend the measure of immediate abolition, should be admitted gradually to lessen by the lapse of a few years, yet in point of principle the absence of all right of interference would remain the same. My right honourable friend, therefore, I am sure, will not press an argument not less hostile to his proposition than to ours.

But let us investigate the foundation of this objection, and I will commence what I have to say by putting a question to my right honourable friend. It is chiefly on the presumed ground of our being bound by a parliamentary sanction heretofore given to the African slave trade, that this argument against the abolition is rested. Does, then, my right honourable friend, or does any man in this House think, that the slave trade has received any such parliamentary sanction as must place it more out of the jurisdiction of the legislature for ever after, than the other branches of our national commerce? I ask, is there any one regulation of any part of our commerce, which, if this argument be valid, may not equally be objected to, on the ground of its affecting some man's patrimony, some man's property, or some man's expectations? Let it never be forgotten that the argument I am canvassing would be just as strong if the possession affected were small, and the possessors humble; for on every principle of justice, the property of any single individual, or small number of individuals, is as sacred as that of the great body of West Indians. Justice ought to extend her protection with rigid impartiality to the rich and to the poor, to the powerful and to the

humble. If this be the case, in what a situation does my right honourable friend's argument place the legislature of Britain? What room is left for their interference in the regulation of any part of our commerce? It is scarcely possible to lay a duty on any one article which may not, when first imposed, be said in some way to affect the property of individuals, and even of some entire classes of the community. If the laws respecting the slave trade imply a contract for its perpetual continuance, I will venture to say there does not pass a year without some Act equally pledging the faith of Parliament to the perpetuating of some other branch of commerce. In short, I repeat my observation, that no new tax can be imposed, much less can any prohibitory duty be ever laid on any branch of trade that has before been regulated by Parliament, if this principle be once admitted.

Before I refer to the Acts of Parliament by which the public faith is said to be pledged, let me remark, also, that a contract for the continuance of the slave trade must, on the principles which I shall presently insist on, have been void, even from the beginning; for if this trade is an outrage upon justice, and only another name for fraud, robbery, and murder, will any man urge that the legislature could possibly by any pledge whatever incur the obligation of being an accessory, or, I may even say, a principal in the commission of such enormities, by sanctioning their continuance? As well might an individual think himself bound by a promise to commit an assassination. I am confident gentlemen must see that our proceeding on such grounds would infringe all the principles of law, and subvert the very foundation of morality.

Let us now see how far these Acts themselves show that there is that sort of parliamentary pledge to continue the African slave trade. The Act of 23 George II., c. xxxi., is that by which we are supposed to be bound up by contract, to sanction all those horrors now so incontrovertibly proved. How surprised, then, sir, must the House be to find that, by a clause of their very Act, some of these outrages are expressly forbidden! It says: "No commander or master of a ship trading to Africa shall by fraud, force, or violence, or by any indirect practice whatsoever, take on board or carry away from the coast of Africa any negro or native of the said country, or commit any violence on the natives, to the prejudice of the said trade, and that every person so offending shall for every such offence forfeit," etc. When it comes to the penalty, sorry am I to say, that we see too close a resemblance to the West India law, which inflicts the payment of £30 as the punishment for murdering a negro. The price of blood in Africa is £100, but even this penalty is enough to prove that the Act at least does not sanction, much less does it engage to perpetuate, enormities; and the whole trade has now been demonstrated to be a mass, a system of enormities; of enormities which incontrovertibly bid defiance not only to this clause, but to every regulation which our ingenuity can devise and our power carry into effect. Nothing can accomplish the object of this clause but an extinction of the trade itself.

But, sir, let us see what was the motive for carrying on the trade at all. The preamble of the Act states it: "Whereas, the trade to and from Africa is very advantageous to Great Britain, and necessary for the supplying the plantations and colonies thereunto belonging with a sufficient number of negroes at reasonable rates, and for that purpose the said trade should be carried on," etc. Here, then, we see what the Parliament had in view when it passed this Act; and I have clearly shown that not one of the occasions on which it grounded its proceedings now exists. I may then plead, I think, the very Act itself as an argument for the abolition. If it is shown that, instead of being "very advantageous" to Great Britain, this trade is the most destructive that can well be imagined to her interests; that it is the ruin of our seamen; that it stops the extension of our manufactures; if it is proved, in the second place, that it is not now necessary for the "supplying our plantations with negroes;" if it is further established that this traffic was from the very beginning contrary to the first principles of justice, and consequently that a pledge for its continuance, had one been attempted to be given, must have been completely and absolutely void; where then in this Act of Parliament is the contract to be found by which Britain is bound, as she is said to be, never to listen to her own true interests, and to the cries of the natives of Africa? Is it not clear that all argument, founded on the supposed pledged faith of Parliament, makes against those who employ it? I refer you to the principles which obtain in other cases. Every trade Act shows undoubtedly that the legislature is used to pay a tender regard to all classes of the community. But if, for the sake of moral duty, of national honour, or even of great political advantage, it is thought right, by authority of Parliament, to alter any long-established system, Parliament is competent to do it. The legislature will undoubtedly be careful to subject individuals to as little inconvenience as possible; and if any peculiar hardship should arise that can be distinctly stated and fairly pleaded, there will ever, I am sure, be a liberal feeling toward them in the legislature of this country, which is the guardian of all who live under its protection. On the present occasion, the most powerful considerations call upon us to abolish the slave trade; and if we refuse to attend to them on the alleged ground of pledged faith and contract, we shall depart as widely from the practice of Parliament as from the path of moral duty. If, indeed, there is any case of hardship which comes within

the proper cognisance of Parliament, and calls for the exercise of its liberality—well! But such a case must be reserved for calm consideration, as a matter distinct from the present question.

I beg pardon for dwelling so long on the argument of expediency, and on the manner in which it affects the West Indies. I have been carried away by my own feelings on some of these points into a greater length than I intended, especially considering how fully the subject has been already argued. The result of all I have said is, that there exists no impediment, no obstacle, no shadow of reasonable objection on the ground of pledged faith, or even on that of national expediency, to the abolition of this trade. On the contrary, all the arguments drawn from those sources plead for it, and they plead much more loudly, and much more strongly in every part of the question, for an immediate than for a gradual abolition.

III. But now, sir, I come to Africa. That is the ground on which I rest, and here it is that I say my right honourable friends do not carry their principles to their full extent. Why ought the slave trade to be abolished? *Because it is incurable* INJUSTICE! How much stronger, then, is the argument for immediate than gradual abolition! By allowing it to continue even for one hour, do not my right honourable friends weaken—do not they desert their own argument of its injustice? If on the ground of injustice it ought to be abolished at last, why ought it not now? Why is injustice to be suffered to remain for a single hour? From what I hear without doors, it is evident that there is a general conviction entertained of its being far from just, and from that very conviction of its injustice some men have been led, I fear, to the supposition that the slave trade never could have been permitted to begin, but from some strong and irresistible necessity; a necessity, however, which, if it was fancied to exist at first, I have shown cannot be thought by any man whatever to exist at present. This plea of necessity, thus presumed, and presumed, as I suspect, from the circumstance of injustice itself, has caused a sort of acquiescence in the continuance of this evil. Men have been led to place it in the rank of those necessary evils which are supposed to be the lot of human creatures, and to be permitted to fall upon some countries or individuals, rather than upon others, by that Being whose ways are inscrutable to us, and whose dispensations, it is conceived, we ought not to look into. The origin of evil is, indeed, a subject beyond the reach of the human understanding; and the permission of it by the Supreme Being, is a subject into which it belongs not to us to inquire. But where the evil in question is a moral evil which a man can scrutinise, and where that moral evil has its origin with ourselves, let us not imagine that we can clear our consciences by this general, not to say irreligious and impious way of laying aside the question. If we reflect at all on this subject, we must see that every necessary evil supposes that some other and greater evil would be incurred were it removed. I therefore desire to ask, what can be that greater evil which can be stated to over-balance the one in question? I know of no evil that ever has existed, nor can imagine any evil to exist, worse than the tearing of EIGHTY THOUSAND PERSONS annually from their native land, by a combination of the most civilised nations in the most enlightened quarter of the globe; but more especially by that nation which calls herself the most free and the most happy of them all. Even if these miserable beings were proved guilty of every crime before you take them off, of which, however, not a single proof is adduced, ought *we* to take upon ourselves the office of executioners? And even if we condescend so far, still can we be justified in taking them, unless we have clear proof that they are criminals?

But if we go much further; if we ourselves tempt them to sell their fellow-creatures to us, we may rest assured that they will take care to provide by every method, by kidnapping, by village-breaking, by unjust wars, by iniquitous condemnations, by rendering Africa a scene of bloodshed and misery, a supply of victims increasing in proportion to our demand. Can we, then, hesitate in deciding whether the wars in Africa are their wars or ours? It was our arms in the river Cameroon, put into the hands of the trader, that furnished him with the means of pushing his trade; and I have no more doubt that they are British arms put into the hands of Africans, which promote universal war and desolation, than I can doubt their having done so in that individual instance.

I have shown how great is the enormity of this evil, even on the supposition that we take only convicts and prisoners of war. But take the subject in the other way; take it on the grounds stated by the right honourable gentleman over the way; and how does it stand? Think of EIGHTY THOUSAND persons carried away out of their country by *we know not what means;* for crimes imputed, for light or inconsiderable faults, for debt, perhaps, for the crime of witchcraft, or a thousand other weak and scandalous pretexts! Besides all the fraud and kidnapping, the villainies and perfidy, by which the slave trade is supplied. Reflect on these eighty thousand persons thus annually taken off! There is something in the horror of it that surpasses all the bounds of imagination. Admitting that there exists in Africa something like to courts of justice; yet what an office of humiliation and meanness is it in us to take upon ourselves to carry into execution the partial, the cruel, iniquitous sentences of such courts, as if we also were strangers to all religion and to the first principles of justice.

But that country, it is said, has been in some degree civilised, and civilised by us. It is said they have gained some knowledge of the principles of justice. What, sir, have they gained the principles of justice from *us*? Is their civilisation brought about by us? Yes, we give them enough of our intercourse to convey to them the means, and to initiate them in the study of mutual destruction. We give them just enough of the forms of justice to enable them to add the pretext of legal trials to their other modes of perpetrating the most atrocious iniquity. We give them just enough of European improvements to enable them the more effectually to turn Africa into a ravaged wilderness. Some evidences say that the Africans are addicted to the practice of gambling; that they even sell their wives and children, and ultimately themselves. Are these, then, the legitimate sources of slavery? Shall we pretend that we can thus acquire an honest right to exact the labour of these people? Can we pretend that we have a right to carry away to distant regions men of whom we know nothing by authentic inquiry, and of whom there is every reasonable presumption to think that those who sell them to us have no right to do so? But the evil does not stop here. I feel that there is not time for me to make all the remarks which the subject deserves, and I refrain from attempting to enumerate half the dreadful consequences of this system. Do you think nothing of the ruin and the miseries in which so many other individuals, still remaining in Africa, are involved in consequence of carrying off so many myriads of people? Do you think nothing of their families which are left behind; of the connections which are broken; of the friendships, attachments, and relationships that are burst asunder? Do you think nothing of the miseries in consequence, that are felt from generation to generation; of the privation of that happiness which might be communicated to them by the introduction of civilisation, and of mental and moral improvement? A happiness which you withhold from them so long as you permit the slave trade to continue. What do you yet know of the internal state of Africa? You have carried on a trade to that quarter of the globe from this civilised and enlightened country; but such a trade, that, instead of diffusing either knowledge or wealth, it has been the check to every laudable pursuit. Instead of any fair interchange of commodities; instead of conveying to them, from this highly favoured land, any means of improvement, you carry with you that noxious plant by which everything is withered and blasted; under whose shade nothing that is useful or profitable to Africa will ever flourish or take root. Long as that continent has been known to navigators, the extreme line and boundaries of its coasts is all with which Europe has yet become acquainted; while other countries in the same parallel of latitude, through a happier system of intercourse, have reaped the blessings of a mutually beneficial commerce. But as to the whole interior of that continent, you are, by your own principles of commerce, as yet entirely shut out. Africa is known to you only in its skirts.* Yet even there you are able to infuse a poison that spreads its contagious effects from one end of it to the other; which penetrates to its very centre, corrupting every part to which it reaches. You there subvert the whole order of nature; you aggravate every natural barbarity, and furnish to every man living on that continent motives for committing, under the name and pretext of commerce, acts of perpetual violence and perfidy against his neighbour.

Thus, sir, has the perversion of British commerce carried misery instead of happiness to one whole quarter of the globe. False to the very principles of trade, misguided in our policy, and unmindful of our duty, what astonishing, I had almost said, what *irreparable* mischief, have we brought upon that continent! How shall we hope to obtain, if it be possible, forgiveness from Heaven for those enormous evils we have committed, if we refuse to make use of those means which the mercy of Providence hath still reserved to us, for wiping away the guilt and shame with which we are now covered. If we refuse even this degree of compensation; if, knowing the miseries we have caused, we refuse even now to put a stop to them, how greatly aggravated will be the guilt of Great Britain! and what a blot will these transactions for ever be in the history of this country! Shall we, then, delay to repair these injuries, and to begin rendering justice to Africa? Shall we not count the days and hours that are suffered to intervene, and to delay the accomplishment of such a work? Reflect what an immense object is before you; what an object for a nation to have in view, and to have a prospect, under the favour of Providence, of being now permitted to attain! I think the House will agree with me in cherishing the ardent wish to enter without delay upon the measures necessary for these great ends; and I am sure that the

* Every passing month, more especially in recent years, has been happily making the above less and less true. Dr Livingstone, Speke, Burton, Stanley, and others, have all helped to unfold the interior of the continent. Commander Cameron, entering Africa on the east coast, after three years of unheard-of difficulties and dangers, emerged, in November 1875, at Benguela, on the west coast, having done two thousand miles as the crow flies. Missionary effort is quickly following up the discoveries of our explorers, and is having a proportionate effect in lessening the slave traffic. Many thousands of slaves were formerly taken away from the district around Lake Nyassa; but since the settlement of a mission station there, only forty were taken during 1876. Mission settlements are already established, or in process of establishment, at the other principal African lakes—Tanganyika, Victoria Nyanza, and Albert Nyanza.

immediate abolition of the slave trade is the first, the principal, the most indispensable act of policy, of duty, and of justice, that the legislature of this country has to take, if it is indeed their wish to secure those important objects to which I have alluded, and which we are bound to pursue by the most solemn obligations.

There is, however, one argument set up as a universal answer to everything that can be urged on our side; whether we address ourselves to the understandings of our opponents, or to their hearts and consciences. It is necessary I should remove this formidable objection; for, though not often stated in distinct terms, I fear it is one which has a very wide influence. The slave trade system, it is supposed, has taken so deep root in Africa, that it is absurd to think of its being eradicated; and the abolition of that share of trade carried on by Great Britain, and especially if her example is not followed by other powers, is likely to be of very little service. Give me leave to say, in reply to so dangerous an argument, that we ought to be extremely sure, indeed, of the assumption on which it rests, before we venture to rely on its validity; before we decide that an evil which we ourselves contribute to inflict is incurable, and on that very plea, refuse to desist from bearing our part in the system which produces it. You are not sure, it is said, that other nations will give up the trade, if you should renounce it. I answer, if this trade is as criminal as it is asserted to be, or if it has in it a thousandth part of the criminality which I and others, after thorough investigation of the subject, charge upon it, God forbid that we should hesitate in determining to relinquish so iniquitous a traffic, even though it should be retained by other countries. God forbid, however, that we should fail to do our utmost toward inducing other countries to abandon a bloody commerce, which they have probably been, in a good measure, led by our example to pursue. God forbid that we should be capable of wishing to arrogate to ourselves the glory of being singular in renouncing it!

I tremble at the thought of gentlemen's indulging themselves in this argument, an argument as pernicious as it is futile. "We are friends," say they, "to humanity. We are second to none of you in our zeal for the good of Africa; but the French will not abolish—the Dutch will not abolish. We wait, therefore, on prudential principles, till they join us, or set us an example."

How, sir, is this enormous evil ever to be eradicated, if every nation is thus prudentially to wait till the concurrence of all the world shall have been obtained? Let me remark, too, that there is no nation in Europe that has, on the one hand, plunged so deeply into this guilt as Britain; or that is so likely, on the other, to be looked up to as an example, if she should have the manliness to be the first in decidedly renouncing it. But, sir, does not this argument apply a thousand times more strongly in a contrary way? How much more justly may other nations point to us, and say, "Why should we abolish the slave trade, when Great Britain has not abolished? Britain, free as she is, just and honourable as she is, and deeply, also, involved as she is in this commerce above all nations, not only has not abolished, but has refused to abolish. She has investigated it well; she has gained the completest insight into its nature and effects; she has collected volumes of evidence on every branch of the subject. Her senate has deliberated—has deliberated again and again; and what is the result? She has gravely and solemnly determined to sanction the slave trade. She sanctions it at least for a while—her legislature, therefore, it is plain, sees no guilt in it, and has thus furnished us with the strongest evidence that she can furnish—of the justice unquestionably—and of the policy also, in a certain measure, and in certain cases at least, of permitting this traffic to continue."

This, sir, is the argument with which we furnish the other nations of Europe, if we again refuse to put an end to the slave trade. Instead, therefore, of imagining, that by choosing to presume on their continuing it, we shall have exempted ourselves from guilt, and have transferred the whole criminality to them; let us rather reflect that, on the very principle urged against us, we shall henceforth have to answer for their crimes, as well as our own. We have strong reasons to believe that it depends upon us, whether other countries will persist in this bloody trade or not. Already we have suffered one year to pass away, and now the question is renewed, a proposition is made for gradual, with the view of preventing immediate abolition. I know the difficulty that exists in attempting to reform long-established abuses; and I know the danger arising from the argument in favour of delay, in the case of evils which, nevertheless, are thought too enormous to be borne, when considered as perpetual. But by proposing some other period than the present, by prescribing some condition, by waiting for some contingency, or by refusing to proceed till a thousand favourable circumstances unite together; perhaps until we obtain the general concurrence of Europe (a concurrence which I believe never yet took place at the commencement of any one improvement in policy or in morals), year after year escapes, and the most enormous evils go unredressed. We see this abundantly exemplified, not only in public, but in private life. Similar observations have been often applied to the case of personal reformation. If you go into the street, it is a chance but the first person who crosses you is one.

"Qui recte vivendi prorogat horam."

("He who delays the hour of living well,
Stands like the rustic on a river's brink,
To see the stream run out; but on it flows,
And still shall flow with current never ceasing.")
—*Epistles of Horace*, book i., epistle 2.

We may wait; we may delay to cross the stream before us, till it has run down; but we shall wait for ever, for the river will still flow on, without being exhausted. We shall be no nearer the object which we profess to have in view, so long as the step, which alone can bring us to it, is not taken. Until the actual, the only remedy is applied, we ought neither to flatter ourselves that we have as yet thoroughly laid to heart the evil we affect to deplore, nor that there is as yet any reasonable assurance of its being brought to an actual termination.

It has also been occasionally urged, that there is something in the disposition and nature of the Africans themselves which renders all prospect of civilisation on that continent extremely unpromising. "It has been known," says Mr Frazer, in his evidence, "that a boy has been put to death who was refused to be purchased as a slave." This single story was deemed by that gentleman a sufficient proof of the barbarity of the Africans, and of the inutility of abolishing the slave trade. My honourable friend, however, has told you that this boy had previously run away from his master three several times; that the master had to pay his value, according to the custom of the country, every time he was brought back; and that partly from anger at the boy for running away so frequently, and partly to prevent a still further repetition of the same expense, he determined to put him to death. Such was the explanation of the story given in the cross-examination. This, sir, is the signal instance that has been dwelt upon of African barbarity. This African, we admit, was unenlightened, and altogether barbarous; but let us now ask, what would a *civilised* and *enlightened West Indian*, or a body of West Indians, have done in any case of a parallel nature? I will quote you, sir, a law passed in the West Indies in the year 1722, which in turning over the book I happened just now to cast my eye upon; by which law, this very same crime of running away, is, by the legislature of the island, by the grave and deliberate sentence of that enlightened legislature, *punished with death;* and this not in the case only of the *third* offence, but even in the very *first* instance. It is enacted, "That if any negro or other slave shall withdraw himself from his master for the term of six months; or any slave that was absent shall not return within that time, it shall be adjudged felony, and every such person shall suffer death." There is another West India law, by which every negro's hand is armed against his fellow-negroes, by his being authorised to kill a runaway slave, and even having a reward held out to him for doing so. Let the House now contrast the two cases. Let them ask themselves which of the two exhibits the greater barbarity? Let them reflect, with a little candour and liberality, whether on the ground of any of those facts, and loose insinuations as to the sacrifices to be met with in the evidence, they can possibly reconcile to themselves the excluding of Africa from all means of civilisation; whether they can possibly vote for the continuance of the slave trade upon the principle that the Africans have shown themselves to be a race of *incorrigible barbarians.*

I hope, therefore, we shall hear no more of the moral impossibility of civilising the Africans, nor have our understandings and consciences again insulted, by being called upon to sanction the slave trade, until other nations shall have set the example of abolishing it. While we have been deliberating upon the subject, one nation, not ordinarily taking the lead in politics, nor by any means remarkable for the boldness of its councils, has determined on a gradual abolition;* a determination, indeed, since it permits for a time the existence of the slave trade, would be an unfortunate pattern for our imitation. France, it is said, will take up the trade if we relinquish it. What? Is it supposed that in the present situation of St Domingo, of an island which used to take three-fourths of all the slaves required by the colonies of France, she, of all countries, will think of taking it up? What countries remain? The Portuguese, the Dutch, and the Spaniards. Of those countries, let me declare it is my opinion that, if they see us renounce the trade after full deliberation, they will not be disposed, even on principles of policy, to rush further into it. But I say more. How are they to furnish the capital necessary for carrying it on? If there is any aggravation of our guilt, in this wretched business, greater than another, it is that we have stooped to be the carriers of these miserable beings from Africa to the West Indies for all the other powers of Europe. And now, sir, if we retire from the trade altogether, I ask, where is that fund which is to be raised at once by other nations, equal to the purchase of 30,000 or 40,000 slaves? A fund which, if we rate them at £40 or £50 each, cannot make a capital of less than a million and a half, or two millions of money. From what branch of their commerce is it that these European nations will draw together a fund to feed this monster? to keep alive this detestable commerce? And even if they should make the attempt, will not that immense chasm, which must instantly be created in the other parts of their trade, from which this vast capital must be withdrawn in order to

* Denmark, which (in 1794) made a law that the slave trade should cease at the end of *ten* years, *i.e.*, in 1804.

supply the slave trade, be filled up by yourselves? Will not these branches of commerce which they must leave, and from which they must withdraw their industry and their capitals, in order to apply them to the slave trade, be then taken up by British merchants? Will you not even in this case find your capital flow into these deserted channels? Will not your capital be turned from the slave trade to that natural and innocent commerce from which they must withdraw their capitals in proportion as they take up the traffic in the flesh and blood of their fellow-creatures?

The committee sees, I trust, how little ground of objection to our proposition there is in this part of our adversaries' argument.

Having now detained the House so long, all that I will further add shall be on that important subject, the civilisation of Africa, which I have already shown that I consider as the leading feature in this question. Grieved am I to think that there should be a single person in this country, much more that there should be a single member in the British Parliament, who can look on the present dark, uncultivated, and uncivilised state of that continent as a ground for continuing the slave trade; as a ground not only for refusing to attempt the improvement of Africa, but even for hindering and intercepting every ray of light which might otherwise break in upon her, as a ground for refusing to her the common chance and the common means with which other nations have been blessed, of emerging from their native barbarism.

Here, as in every other branch of this extensive question, the argument of our adversaries pleads against them; for surely, sir, the present deplorable state of Africa, especially when we reflect that her chief calamities are to be ascribed to us, calls for our generous aid, rather than justifies any despair on our part of her recovery, and still less any further repetition of our injuries.

I will not much longer fatigue the attention of the House; but this point has impressed itself so deeply on my mind, that I must trouble the committee with a few additional observations. Are we justified, I ask, on any theory, or by any one instance to be found in the history of the world, from its very beginning to this day, in forming the supposition which I am now combating? Are we justified in supposing that the particular practice which we encourage in Africa, of men's selling each other for slaves, is any symptom of a barbarism that is incurable? Are we justified in supposing that even the practice of offering up human sacrifices proves a total incapacity for civilisation? I believe it will be found, and perhaps much more generally than is supposed, that both the trade in slaves, and the still more savage custom of offering human sacrifices, obtained in former periods, throughout many of those nations which now, by the blessings of Providence, and by a long progression of improvements, are advanced the furthest in civilisation. I believe, sir, that, if we will reflect an instant, we shall find that this observation comes directly home to our own selves; and that, on the same ground on which we are now disposed to proscribe Africa for ever from all possibility of improvement, we ourselves might, in like manner, have been proscribed, and for ever shut out from all the blessings which we now enjoy.

There was a time, sir, which it may be fit sometimes to revive in the remembrance of our countrymen, when even human sacrifices are said to have been offered in this island. But I would especially observe on this day, for it is a case precisely in point, that the very practice of the slave trade once prevailed among us. Slaves, as we may read in Henry's "History of Great Britain," were formerly an established article of our exports. "Great numbers," he says, "were exported like cattle from the British coast, and were to be seen exposed for sale in the Roman market." It does not distinctly appear by what means they were procured; but there was unquestionably no small resemblance, in this particular point, between the case of our ancestors and that of the present wretched natives of Africa; for the historian tells you that "adultery, witchcraft, and debt, were probably some of the chief sources of supplying the Roman market with British slaves; that prisoners taken in war were added to the number; and that there might be among them some unfortunate gamesters who, after having lost all their goods, at length staked themselves, their wives, and their children." Every one of these sources of slavery has been stated, and almost precisely in the same terms, to be at this hour a source of slavery in Africa. And these circumstances, sir, with a solitary instance or two of human sacrifices, furnish the alleged proofs that Africa labours under a natural incapacity for civilisation; that it is enthusiasm and fanaticism to think that she can ever enjoy the knowledge and the morals of Europe; that Providence never intended her to rise above a state of barbarism; that Providence has irrevocably doomed her to be only a nursery for slaves for us free and civilised Europeans. Allow of this principle, as applied to Africa, and I should be glad to know why it might not also have been applied to ancient and uncivilised Britain. Why might not some Roman senator, reasoning on the principles of some honourable gentlemen, and pointing to British barbarians, have predicted with equal boldness, "There is a people that will never rise to civilisation—there is a people destined never to be free—a people without the understanding necessary for the attainment of useful arts; depressed by the hand of Nature below the level of the human species; and created to form a supply of slaves for the rest of the world." Might not this have been said, according to the principles which we

now hear stated, in all respects as fairly and as truly of Britain herself, at that period of her history, as it can now be said by us of the inhabitants of Africa?

We, sir, have long since emerged from barbarism. We have almost forgotten that we were once barbarians. We are now raised to a situation which exhibits a striking contrast to every circumstance by which a Roman might have characterised us, and by which we now characterise Africa. There is, indeed, one thing wanting to complete the contrast, and to clear us altogether from the imputation of acting even to this hour as barbarians; for we continue to this hour a barbarous traffic in slaves; we continue it even yet, in spite of all our great and undeniable pretensions to civilisation. We were once as obscure among the nations of the earth, as savage in our manners, as debased in our morals, as degraded in our understandings, as these unhappy Africans are at present. But in the lapse of a long series of years, by a progression slow, and for a time almost imperceptible, we have become rich in a variety of acquirements, favoured above measure in the gifts of Providence, unrivalled in commerce, pre-eminent in arts, foremost in the pursuits of philosophy and science, and established in all the blessings of civil society. We are in the possession of peace, of happiness, and of liberty. We are under the guidance of a mild and beneficent religion; and we are protected by impartial laws, and the purest administration of justice. We are living under a system of government which our own happy experience leads us to pronounce the best and wisest which has ever yet been framed; a system which has become the admiration of the world. From all these blessings we must for ever have been shut out, had there been any truth in those principles which some gentlemen have not hesitated to lay down as applicable to the case of Africa. Had those principles been true, we ourselves had languished to this hour in that miserable state of ignorance, brutality, and degradation, in which history proves our ancestry to have been immersed. Had other nations adopted these principles in their conduct toward us, had other nations applied to Great Britain the reasoning which some of the senators of this very island now apply to Africa, ages might have passed without our emerging from barbarism; and we who are enjoying the blessings of British civilisation, of British laws, and British liberty, might, at this hour, have been little superior, either in morals, in knowledge, or refinement, to the rude inhabitants of the coast of Guinea.

If, then, we feel that this perpetual confinement in the fetters of brutal ignorance would have been the greatest calamity which could have befallen us; if we view with gratitude and exultation the contrast between the peculiar blessings we enjoy, and the wretchedness of the ancient inhabitants of Britain; if we shudder to think of the misery which would still have overwhelmed us had Great Britain continued to the present times to be a mart for slaves to the more civilised nations of the world, through some cruel policy of theirs, God forbid that *we* should any longer subject Africa to the same dreadful scourge, and preclude the light of knowledge, which has reached every other quarter of the globe, from having access to her coasts.

I trust we shall no longer continue this commerce, to the destruction of every improvement on that wide continent; and shall not consider ourselves as conferring too great a boon, in restoring its inhabitants to the rank of human beings. I trust we shall not think ourselves too liberal, if, by abolishing the slave trade, we give them the same common chance of civilisation with other parts of the world, and that we shall now allow to Africa the opportunity, the hope, the prospect of attaining to the same blessings which we ourselves, through the favourable dispensations of Divine Providence, have been permitted, at a much more early period, to enjoy. If we listen to the voice of reason and duty, and pursue this night the line of conduct which they prescribe, some of us may live to see a reverse of that picture from which we now turn our eyes with shame and regret. We may live to behold the natives of Africa engaged in the calm occupations of industry, in the pursuits of a just and legitimate commerce. We may behold the beams of science and philosophy breaking in upon their land, which at some happy period in still later times may blaze with full lustre; and joining their influence to that of pure religion, may illuminate and invigorate the most distant extremities of that immense continent. Then may we hope that even Africa, though last of all the quarters of the globe, shall enjoy at length, in the evening of her days, those blessings which have descended so plentifully upon us in a much earlier period of the world. Then, also, will Europe, participating in her improvement and prosperity, receive an ample recompense for the tardy kindness (if kindness it can be called) of no longer hindering that continent from extricating herself out of the darkness which, in other more fortunate regions, has been so much more speedily dispelled.

"——Nos que ubi primus equis oriens afflavit anhelis;
Illic sera rubens accendit lumina vesper."

("On us, while early dawn with panting steeds,
Breathes at his rising, ruddy eve for *them*
Lights up her fires slow-coming.")

—*Virgil's Georgics.*

Then, sir, may be applied to Africa those words, originally used, indeed, with a different view:

"His demum exactis———
Devenere locos lætos, et amœna vireta

Fortunatorum nemorum, sedesque beatas,
Largior hic campos Æther et lumine vestit
Purpuero."

("These rites performed, they reach those happy fields,
Gardens, and groves, and seats of living joy,
Where the pure ether spreads with wider sway,
And throws a purple light o'er all the plains.")
—*Virgil's Æneid*, book vi.

It is in this view, sir—it is an atonement for our long and cruel injustice toward Africa, that the measure proposed by my honourable friend most forcibly recommends itself to my mind. The great and happy change to be expected in the state of her inhabitants, is, of all the various and important benefits of the abolition, in my estimation, incomparably the most extensive and important.

I shall vote, sir, against the adjournment; and I shall also oppose to the utmost every proposition which in any way may tend either to prevent, or even to postpone for an hour, the total abolition of the slave trade: a measure which, on all the various grounds which I have stated, we are bound, by the most pressing and indispensable duty, to adopt.

[The impression made by this speech was so great that all the spectators present believed that the vote in favour of Pitt's motion would be carried. Mr Dundas's plan of gradual abolition, however, had the preference by a majority of sixty-eight votes. His scheme, brought forward in detail, was lost in the House of Lords. Through the untiring labours of Wilberforce, after Pitt's death, a resolution was passed in 1806, to the effect "that the slave trade was inconsistent with justice, humanity, and sound policy, and that measures ought to be taken for its immediate abolition." On 1st January 1808, a bill to this effect became law. In America in 1794, and again in 1800, traffic in slaves had been declared illegal. In 1807, an Act was passed that, after the beginning of January 1808, the importation of slaves into the United States would be illegal. In 1820 the slave trade was declared to be piracy by the American Congress, and in 1824 the same was declared by the British Parliament.]

THE RUPTURE OF THE NEGOTIATIONS FOR PEACE WITH FRANCE.*

If we look to the whole complexion of this transaction, the duplicity, the arrogance, and violence which has appeared in the course of the negotiation with the French government, if we take from thence our opinion of its general result, we shall be justified in our conclusion—not that the people of France—not that the whole government of France—but that part of the government which had too much influence, and has now the whole ascendency, never was sincere—was determined to accept of no terms but such as would make it neither durable nor safe; such as could only be accepted by this country by a surrender of all its interests, and by a sacrifice of every pretension to the character of a great, a powerful, or an independent nation.

This, sir, is inference no longer. You have their own open avowal. You have it stated in the subsequent declaration of France itself that it is not against your commerce, that it is not against your wealth, it is not against your possessions in the East, or your colonies in the West, it is not against even the source of your maritime greatness, it is not against any of the appendages of your empire, but against the very essence of liberty, against the foundation of your independence, against the citadel of your happiness, against your constitution itself, that their hostilities are directed. They have themselves announced and proclaimed the proposition that what they mean to bring with their invading armies is the genius of *their* liberty. I desire no other word to express the subversion of the British constitution, and the substitution of the most malignant and fatal contrast—the annihilation of British liberty, and the obliteration of everything that has rendered you a great, a flourishing, and a happy people.

This is what is at issue. From this are we to declare ourselves in a manner that deprecates the rage which our enemies will not dissemble, and which will be little moved by our entreaty! Under such circumstances are we ashamed or afraid to declare, in a firm and manly tone, our resolution to defend ourselves, or to speak the language of truth with the energy that belongs to Englishmen united in such a cause? Sir, I do not scruple, for one, to say, "If I knew nothing by which I could state to myself a probability of the contest terminating in our favour, I would maintain that the contest with its worst chances is preferable to an acquiescence in such demands."

If I could look at this as a dry question of prudence, if I could calculate it upon the mere grounds of interest, I would say, if we love that degree of national power which is necessary for the independence of the country and its safety, if we regard domestic tranquillity, if we look at individual enjoyment from the highest to the meanest among us, there is not a man whose stake is so great in the country that he ought to hesitate a moment in sacrificing any portion of it to oppose the violence of the enemy—nor is there, I trust, a man in this happy and free nation whose stake is so small that would not be ready to sacrifice his life in the same cause. If we look at it with a view to *safety*, this would be our conduct. But if we look at it upon the principle of true honour, of the character which

* Delivered in the House of Commons, November 1797.

we have to support, of the example which we have to set to the other nations of Europe; if we view rightly the lot in which Providence has placed us, and the contrast between ourselves and all the other countries in Europe, gratitude to that Providence should inspire us to make every effort in such a cause. There may be danger; but on the one side there is danger accompanied with honour; on the other side there is danger, with indelible shame and disgrace; upon such an alternative Englishmen will not hesitate. I wish to disguise no part of my sentiments upon the grounds on which I put the issue of the contest. I ask, whether up to the principles I have stated we are prepared to act? Having done so, my opinion is not altered; my hopes, however, are animated by the reflection that the means of our safety are in our own hands; for there never was a period when we had more to encourage us. In spite of heavy burdens, the radical strength of the nation never showed itself more conspicuous; its revenue never exhibited greater proofs of the wealth of the country; the same objects which constitute the blessings we have to fight for furnish us with the means of continuing them. But it is not upon that point I rest. There is one great resource, which I trust will never abandon us, and which has shone forth in the English character, by which we have preserved our existence and fame as a nation, which I trust we shall be determined never to abandon under any extremity, but shall join hand and heart in the solemn pledge that is proposed to us, and declare to his majesty "that we know great exertions are wanted; that we are prepared to make them; and are, at all events, determined to stand or fall by the laws, liberties, and religion of our country."

[The House was completely electrified by this speech, and the greater body of the nation rallied round king and Parliament. A subscription was raised of £1,500,000 sterling, as a voluntary donation to meet the increased expenses of the war; and Mr Pitt was permitted so to modify his system of taxation as to produce a vast accession to the regular income of the government. This enabled him to renew the contest with increased vigour.]

WILLIAM WILBERFORCE.

1759-1833.

TO THE ELECTORS OF HULL.*

GENTLEMEN,—To a mind not utterly devoid of feeling it must ever be peculiarly interesting to visit, after a long absence, the residence of childhood, and of early youth. This is now my situation; and every object, and many of the faces I behold around me, are such as were familiar to me in my earliest years; while I am reminded of many friends and connections, some of them near and dear to me, who are now no more. The emotions thus excited really distract my thoughts; but I can truly assure you, that whatever deficiency may be thereby occasioned in the expression of my sentiments, will be more than made up by those feelings of gratitude and attachment which at this moment powerfully affect my heart. I am naturally led to retrace the journey of life, until I reach the period when I first became the object of your public notice; for it was your kindness, gentlemen, which first called me into public life, and in my earliest manhood placed me in the honourable situation of your representative. While I filled that office I endeavoured to discharge its duties with industry and fidelity, and when I ceased to be your immediate representative, I did not cease to feel an interest in your welfare. With many of you, indeed, I continued still to be connected in the same relation.

Of the manner in which I discharged my parliamentary duty, and of the principles by which it was regulated, it is not for me to speak. I may be said to have lived in public; my conduct has been open to you all, and I have the satisfaction of knowing that in general it has been honoured with your approbation. I am no party-man—measures, not men, were the object of my concern. I formed early a friendly connection with the great minister [William Pitt] who so long presided over the councils of this country, and our friendship was dissolved only by his death. In common with most of you, I, in general, approved his measures, and had the satisfaction of finding the dictates of public duty coincide with the impulse of private friendship. But I never addicted myself to him so closely as not to consider every question and every measure with

---

* Delivered 1807. Although Wilberforce was so vitally connected with the discussions on the abolition of the slave trade, yet as Pitt's speech on this subject has already been given, this specimen of his style is inserted.

impartiality and freedom, and I supported or opposed him as my judgment and conscience prescribed. Suffer me, gentlemen, to condole with you for a moment on the loss of that great man, and to pay a just tribute to his memory. You know, in common with the world, the force of his talents, and the splendour of his eloquence; but they who were the companions of his private hours can alone sufficiently testify the warmth and incessant activity of his patriotism, and how, negligent only of his own personal interest, he was unceasingly anxious for the safety and prosperity of his country. Great, however, as was the respect and attachment I entertained for him, I yet sometimes opposed his measures, at no small cost of private feeling; while he on his part was liberal enough to give me credit for my motives, and to continue to receive me with unabated confidence and regard. It gratifies me to believe that in the main you concurred with me in the general approbation of his measures; and while it must be confessed that he lived in times of peculiar difficulty and danger, we have had the satisfaction during his administration of finding our country gradually advancing in internal prosperity.

I congratulate you on the improvement which we witness, and on the increased population and affluence I have observed in every part of our great country. In the West Riding, which I have just visited, I have been beholding the effects of manufacturing industry; here I see those of commercial enterprise; and these very fields, in which I so often walked and played in my infancy, are filled with the habitations of men But it gratifies me both there and here to find that you are not so absorbed in the pursuit of your particular schemes, or the promotion of your personal interests, as not to be attentive also to the public welfare, and to be ready to come forth at your country's call, whatever be the service she may require of you; whether it be to defend her with your arms, or to serve her no less effectually in administering her justice. Here, gentlemen, we see the happy effect of our free constitution, which, under the blessing of Providence, has been the instrument of dispensing greater civil happiness for a longer period and to a greater body of men, than any system of political government in any other age or quarter of the world. I am glad, gentlemen, to know that I am addressing those who, like myself, revere this excellent constitution, and assign its just nature to each of its respective parts; who know that all the three branches of it are equally necessary, and who understand that liberty and loyalty can co-exist in harmonious and happy combination. Gentlemen, so long as you thus understand the constitution under which you live, and know its nature, so long you will be safe and happy, and, notwithstanding the varieties of political opinion which will exist in a free country, you will present a firm and united front against every foreign enemy. Great countries are perhaps never conquered solely from without, and while this spirit of patriotism and its effects continue to flourish, you may, with the favour of Providence, bid defiance to the power of the greatest of our adversaries. On these prospects let me congratulate you, and let me assure you that if, through your kindness, and that of the other freeholders of Yorkshire, I should once more receive the honourable trust which has now been five times reposed in me, it will be my care to watch over your interests and promote your welfare.

ROBERT HALL.

1764-1831.

THE ADVANTAGES OF KNOWLEDGE TO THE LOWER CLASSES.*

THROUGHOUT every part of this book the author is copious, and even profuse, in the praises of knowledge. To stimulate to the acquisition of it, and to assist in the pursuit, is the professed design with which it was penned. "To know wisdom and instruction; to perceive the words of understanding; to receive the instruction of wisdom, justice, judgment, and equity; to give subtlety to the simple, to the young man knowledge and discretion."

Though it is evident from many passages, that in the encomiums to which we have referred, the author had principally in view divine knowledge, yet from other parts it is equally certain he by no means intended to exclude from these commendations knowledge in general; and as we propose this afternoon to recommend to your attention the Sabbath-day school established in this place, a few reflections on the utility of knowledge at large, and of religious knowledge in particular, will not be deemed unreasonable.

I. Let me request your attention to a few re-

* "That the soul be without knowledge, it is not good" (Prov. xix. 2).

marks on the utility of knowledge in general. It must strike us, in the first place, that the extent to which we have the faculty of acquiring it, forms the most obvious distinction of our species. In inferior animals it subsists in so small a degree, that we are wont to deny it to them altogether; the range of their knowledge, if it deserves the name, is so extremely limited, and their ideas so few and simple. Whatever is most exquisite in their operations is referred to an instinct, which, working within a narrow compass, though with undeviating uniformity, supplies the place, and supersedes the necessity, of reason. In inferior animals the knowledge of the whole species is possessed by each individual of the species, while man is distinguished by numberless diversities in the scale of mental improvement. Now, to be destitute in a remarkable degree of an acquisition which forms the appropriate possession of human nature, is degrading to that nature, and must proportionably disqualify it for reaching the end of its creation.

As the power of acquiring knowledge is to be ascribed to reason, so the attainment of it mightily strengthens and improves it, and thereby enables it to enrich itself with further acquisitions. Knowledge in general expands the mind, exalts the faculties, refines the taste of pleasure, and opens numerous sources of intellectual enjoyment. By means of it we become less dependent for satisfaction upon the sensitive appetites, the gross pleasures of sense are more easily despised, and we are made to feel the superiority of the spiritual to the material part of our nature. Instead of being continually solicited by the influence and irritation of sensible objects, the mind can retire within herself, and expatiate in the cool and quiet walks of contemplation. The Author of nature has wisely annexed a pleasure to the exercise of our active powers, and particularly to the pursuit of truth, which, if it be in some instances less intense, is far more durable than the gratifications of sense, and is on that account incomparably more valuable. Its duration, to say nothing of its other properties, renders it more valuable. It may be repeated without satiety, and pleases afresh on every reflection upon it. These are self-created satisfactions, always within our reach, not dependent upon events, not requiring a peculiar combination of circumstances to produce or maintain them; they rise from the mind itself, and inhere, so to speak, in its very substance. Let the mind but retain its proper functions, and they spring up spontaneously, unsolicited, unborrowed, and unbought. Even the difficulties and impediments which obstruct the pursuit of truth, serve, according to the economy under which we are placed, to render it more interesting. The labour of intellectual search resembles and exceeds the tumultuous pleasures of the chase; and the consciousness of overcoming a formidable obstacle, or of lighting on some happy discovery, gives all the enjoyment of a conquest, without those corroding reflections by which the latter must be impaired. Can we doubt that Archimedes, who was so absorbed in his contemplations as not to be diverted by the sacking of his native city, and was killed in the very act of meditating a mathematical problem, did not, when he exclaimed, "Ευρηκα! ευρηκα! I have found it! I have found it!" feel a transport as genuine as was ever experienced after the most brilliant victory?

But to return to the moral good which results from the acquisition of knowledge: it is chiefly this, that by multiplying the mental resources, it has a tendency to exalt the character, and, in some measure, to correct and subdue the taste for gross sensuality. It enables the possessor to beguile his leisure moments (and every man has such) in an innocent, at least, if not in a useful, manner. The poor man who can read, and who possesses a taste for reading, can find entertainment at home, without being tempted to repair to the public-house for that purpose. His mind can find him employment when his body is at rest; he does not lie prostrate and float on the current of incidents, liable to be carried whithersoever the impulse of appetite may direct. There is in the mind of such a man an intellectual spring urging him to the pursuit of *mental* good; and if the minds of his family also are a little cultivated, conversation becomes the more interesting, and the sphere of domestic enjoyment enlarged. The calm satisfaction which books afford, puts him into a disposition to relish more exquisitely the tranquil delight inseparable from the indulgence of conjugal and parental affection; and as he will be more respectable in the eyes of his family than he who can teach them nothing, he will be naturally induced to cultivate whatever may preserve, and to shun whatever would impair, that respect. He who is inured to reflection will carry his views beyond the present hour; he will extend his prospect a little into futurity, and be disposed to make some provision for his approaching wants; whence will result an increased motive to industry, together with a care to husband his earnings, and to avoid unnecessary expense. The poor man who has gained a taste for good books will in all likelihood become thoughtful; and when you have given the poor a habit of thinking, you have conferred on them a much greater favour than by the gift of a large sum of money, since you have put them in possession of the *principle* of all legitimate prosperity.

I am persuaded that the extreme profligacy, improvidence, and misery, which are so prevalent among the labouring classes in many countries, are chiefly to be ascribed to the want of education. In proof of this we need only cast our eyes on the condition of the Irish, compared with that of the peasantry in Scotland.

Among the former you behold nothing but beggary, wretchedness, and sloth: in Scotland, on the contrary, under the disadvantages of a worse climate and more unproductive soil, a degree of decency and comfort, the fruit of sobriety and industry, are conspicuous among the lower classes. And to what is this disparity in their situation to be ascribed, except to the influence of education? In Ireland, the education of the poor is miserably neglected; very few of them can read, and they grow up in a total ignorance of what it most befits a rational creature to understand: while in Scotland the establishment of free schools* in every parish, an essential branch of the ecclesiastical constitution of the country, brings the means of instruction within the reach of the poorest, who are there inured to decency, industry, and order.

Some have objected to the instruction of the lower classes, from an apprehension that it would lift them above their sphere, make them dissatisfied with their station in life, and, by impairing the habits of subordination, endanger the tranquillity of the state; an objection devoid surely of all force and validity. It is not easy to conceive in what manner instructing men in their duties can prompt them to neglect those duties, or how that enlargement of reason which enables them to comprehend the true grounds of authority and the obligation to obedience, should indispose them to obey. The admirable mechanism of society, together with that subordination of ranks which is essential to its subsistence, is surely not an elaborate imposture, which the exercise of reason will detect and expose. The objection we have stated implies a reflection on the social order, equally impolitic, invidious, and unjust. Nothing in reality renders legitimate governments so insecure as extreme ignorance in the people. It is this which yields them an easy prey to seduction, makes them the victims of prejudices and false alarms, and so ferocious withal, that their interference in a time of public commotion is more to be dreaded than the eruption of a volcano.

The true prop of good government is the opinion, the perception, on the part of the subject, of benefits resulting from it; a settled conviction, in other words, of its being a public good. Now nothing can produce or maintain that opinion but knowledge, since opinion is a form of knowledge. Of tyrannical and unlawful governments, indeed, the support is fear, to which ignorance is as congenial as it is abhorrent from the genius of a free people. Look at the popular insurrections and massacres in France: of what description of persons were those ruffians composed, who, breaking forth like a torrent, overwhelmed the mounds of lawful authority? Who were the cannibals that sported with the mangled carcases and palpitating limbs of their murdered victims, and dragged them about with their teeth in the gardens of the Tuileries? Were they refined and elaborated into these barbarities by the efforts of a too polished education? No; they were the very scum of the people, destitute of all moral culture, whose atrocity was only equalled by their ignorance, as might well be expected, when the one was the legitimate parent of the other. Who are the persons who, in every country, are most disposed to outrage and violence, but the most ignorant and uneducated of the poor? to which class also chiefly belong those unhappy beings who are doomed to expiate their crimes at the fatal tree; few of whom, it has recently been ascertained on accurate inquiry, are able to read, and the greater part utterly destitute of all moral or religious principle.

Ignorance gives a sort of eternity to prejudice, and perpetuity to error. When a baleful superstition, like that of the Church of Rome, has once got footing among a people in this situation, it becomes next to impossible to eradicate it; for it can only be assailed with success by the weapons of reason and argument, and to these weapons it is impassive. The sword of ethereal temper loses its edge when tried on the scaly hide of this leviathan. No wonder the Church of Rome is such a friend to ignorance; it is but paying the arrears of gratitude in which she is deeply indebted. How is it possible for her not to hate that light which would unveil her impostures, and detect her enormities?

If we survey the genius of Christianity, we shall find it to be just the reverse. It was ushered into the world with the injunction, "Go and teach all nations," and every step of its progress is to be ascribed to instruction. With a condescension worthy of its Author, it offers information to the meanest and most illiterate; but extreme ignorance is not a state of mind favourable to it. The first churches were planted in cities (and those the most celebrated and enlightened), drawn neither from the very highest nor the very lowest classes; the former too often the victims of luxury and pride, the latter sunk in extreme stupidity; but from the middle orders, where the largest portion of virtue and good sense has usually resided. In remote villages its progress was extremely slow, owing, unquestionably, to that want of mental cultivation which rendered them the last retreats of superstition; insomuch that in the fifth cen-

* In the *Edinburgh Christian Instructor* for 1816, the above is thus corrected: "The truth is, that *free* schools could never have effected that improvement in the manners and intelligence of the lower orders in Scotland, for which they are so remarkable; and we have reason to bless the judicious liberality of our ancestors, who contented themselves with bringing education within the reach of the lower orders, by allowing limited salaries to the schoolmasters, *in aid of the school wages*, instead of going to the hurtful extreme which tends to render teachers careless and parents indifferent."

tury the abettors of the ancient idolatry began to be denominated *Pagani*, which properly denotes the inhabitants of the country in distinction from those who reside in towns. At the Reformation the progress of the reformed faith went hand in hand with the advancement of letters; it had everywhere the same friends and the same enemies, and, next to its agreement with the Holy Scriptures, its success is chiefly to be ascribed, under God, to the art of printing, the revival of classical learning, and the illustrious patrons of science attached to its cause. In the representation of that glorious period usually styled the Millennium, when religion shall universally prevail, it is mentioned as a conspicuous feature, that "men shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." That period will not be distinguished from the preceding by men's minds being more torpid and inactive, but rather by the consecration of every power to the service of the Most High. It will be a period of remarkable illumination, during which "the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun as that of seven days." Every useful talent will be cultivated, every art subservient to the interests of man be improved and perfected; learning will amass her stores, and genius emit her splendour; but the former will be displayed without ostentation, and the latter shine with the softened effulgence of humility and love.

II. We have hitherto spoken of the advantages of *knowledge in general;* we proceed to notice the utility of *religious knowledge* in particular. Religion, on account of its intimate relation to a future state, is every man's proper business, and should be his chief care. Of knowledge in general there are branches which it would be preposterous in the bulk of mankind to attempt to acquire, because they have no immediate connection with their duties, and demand talents which nature has denied, or opportunities which Providence has withheld. But with respect to the primary truths of religion, the case is different; they are of such daily use and necessity, that they form not the materials of mental luxury, so properly as the food of the mind. In improving the character, the influence of general knowledge is often feeble and always indirect; of religious knowledge the tendency to purify the heart is immediate, and forms its professed scope and design. "This is life eternal, to know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent." To ascertain the character of the Supreme Author of all things, to know, as far as we are capable of comprehending such a subject, what is His moral disposition, what the situation we stand in towards Him, and the principles by which He conducts His administration, will be allowed by every considerate person to be of the highest consequence. Compared to this, all other speculations and inquiries sink into insignificance; because every event that can befall us is in His hands, and by His sentence our final condition must be fixed. To regard such an inquiry with indifference is the mark, not of a noble, but of an abject mind, which, immersed in sensuality, or amused with trifles, deems itself unworthy of eternal life. To be so absorbed in worldly pursuits as to neglect future prospects, is a conduct that can plead no excuse, until it is ascertained beyond all doubt or contradiction that there is no hereafter, and that nothing remains but that we "eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Even in that case, to forego the hope of immortality without a sigh; to be gay and sportive on the brink of destruction, in the very moment of relinquishing prospects on which the wisest and best in every age have delighted to dwell, is the indication of a base and degenerate spirit. If existence be a good, the eternal loss of it must be a great evil; if it be an evil, reason suggests the propriety of inquiring why it is so, of investigating the maladies by which it is oppressed. Amidst the darkness and uncertainty which hang over our future condition, revelation, by bringing life and immortality to light, affords the only relief. In the Bible alone we learn the real character of the Supreme Being; His holiness, justice, mercy, and truth; the moral condition of man, considered in his relation to Him, is clearly pointed out; the doom of impenitent transgressors denounced; and the method of obtaining mercy, through the interposition of a divine mediator, plainly revealed. There are two considerations which may suffice to evince the indispensable necessity of scriptural knowledge.

1. The Scriptures contain an authentic discovery of the way of salvation. They are a revelation of mercy to a lost world; a reply to that most interesting inquiry, "What we must do to be saved." The distinguishing feature of the Gospel system is the economy of redemption, or the gracious provision the Supreme Being has thought fit to make for reconciling the world to Himself, by the manifestation in human nature of His own Son. It is this which constitutes it the *Gospel*, by way of eminence, or the glad tidings concerning our Saviour Jesus Christ, on the right reception of which, or its rejection, turns our everlasting weal or woe. It is not from the character of God, as our Creator, it should be remembered, that the hope of the guilty can arise; the fullest development of His essential perfections could afford no relief in this case, and therefore natural religion, were it capable of being carried to the utmost perfection, can never supersede the necessity of revealed. To inspire confidence, an express communication from heaven is necessary: since the introduction of sin has produced a peculiarity in our situation, and a perplexity in our prospects, which nothing but an express assurance of mercy can remove.

In what manner the blessed and only Potentate may think fit to dispose of a race of apostates, is

a question on which reason can suggest nothing satisfactory, nothing salutary: a question, in the solution of which, there being no data to proceed upon, wisdom and folly fail alike, and every order of intellect is reduced to a level; for "who hath known the mind of the Lord, or being His counsellor, hath taught Him?" It is a secret which, had He not been pleased to untold it, must have for ever remained in the breast of the Deity. This secret, in infinite mercy, He has condescended to disclose: the silence, not that which John witnessed in the Apocalypse, of half-an-hour, but that of ages, is broken; the darkness is past, and we behold, in the Gospel, the astonishing spectacle of "God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing to them their trespasses," and sending forth His ambassadors to "entreat us in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God." To that strange insensibility with respect to the concerns of a future world, which is at once the indication and consequence of the fall, must we ascribe the languid attention with which this communication is received, instead of producing, as it ought, transports of gratitude and joy in every breast.

This, however we may be disposed to regard it, is unquestionably the grand peculiarity of the Gospel, the exclusive boast and treasure of the Scriptures, and most emphatically *the way of salvation*, not only as it reveals the gracious intentions of God to a sinful world, but as it lays a solid foundation for the *supernatural* duties of faith and repentance. All the discoveries of the Gospel bear a most intimate relation to the character and offices of the Saviour; from Him they emanate, in Him they centre; nor is anything we learn from the Old and New Testament of saving tendency, further than as a part of the truth as it is in Jesus. The neglect of considering revelation in this light is a fruitful source of infidelity. Viewing it in no higher character than a republication of the law of nature, men are first led to doubt the importance, and next the truth, of the discoveries it contains; an easy and natural transition, since the question of their importance is so complicated with that of their truth in the Scriptures themselves, that the most refined ingenuity cannot long keep them separate. "It gives the knowledge of salvation by the remission of sins, through the tender mercy of our God, whereby the day-spring from on high hath visited us, to give light to them that sit in darkness and the shadow of death, to guide our feet in the way of peace." While we contemplate it under this its true character, we view it in its just dimensions, and feel no inclination to extenuate the force of those representations which are expressive of its pre-eminent dignity. There is nothing will be allowed to come into comparison with it, nothing we shall not be ready to sacrifice for a participation of its blessings and the extension of its influence. The veneration we shall feel for the Bible, as the depository of saving knowledge, will be totally distinct, not only from what we attach to any other book, but from that admiration its other properties inspire; and the variety and the antiquity of its history, the light it affords in various researches, its inimitable touches of nature, together with the sublimity and beauty so copiously poured over its pages, will be deemed subsidiary ornaments, the embellishments of the casket, which contains the pearl of great price.

2. Scriptural knowledge is of inestimable value on account of its supplying an infallible rule of life. To the most untutored mind, the information it affords on this subject is far more full and precise than the highest efforts of reason could attain. In the best moral precepts issuing from human wisdom, there is an incurable defect in that want of authority which robs them of their power over the conscience; they are obligatory no further than their reason is perceived; a deduction of proofs is necessary, more or less intricate and uncertain, and even when clearest, it is still but the language of man to man, respectable as sage advice, but wanting the force and authority of law. In a well-attested revelation, it is the Judge speaking from the tribunal, the Supreme Legislator promulgating and interpreting His own laws. With what force and conviction do those apostles and prophets address us, whose miraculous powers attest them to be the servants of the Most High, the immediate organs of the Deity! As the morality of the Gospel is more pure and comprehensive than was ever inculcated before, so the consideration of its divine origination invests it with an energy of which every system not expressly founded upon it is entirely devoid. We turn at our peril from Him who speaketh to us from heaven.

Of an accountable creature, duty is the concern of every moment, since he is every moment pleasing or displeasing God. It is a universal element, mingling with every action, and qualifying every disposition and pursuit. The moral quality of conduct, as it serves both to ascertain and to form the character, has consequences in a future world so certain and infallible, that it is represented in Scripture as a seed no part of which is lost, "for *whatsoever* a man soweth, that also shall he reap." That rectitude which the inspired writers usually denominate *holiness*, is the health and beauty of the soul, capable of bestowing dignity in the absence of every other accomplishment, while the want of it leaves the possessor of the richest intellectual endowments a painted sepulchre. Hence results the indispensable necessity, to every description of persons, of sound religious instruction, and of an intimate acquaintance with the Scriptures, as its genuine source.

It must be confessed, from melancholy experience, that a speculative acquaintance with the rules of duty is too compatible with the

violation of its dictates, and that it is possible for the convictions of conscience to be habitually overpowered by the corrupt suggestions of appetite. To see distinctly the right way, and to pursue it, are not precisely the same thing. Still nothing in the order of means promises so much success as the diligent inculcation of revealed truth. He who is acquainted with the terrors of the Lord, cannot live in the neglect of God and religion with present, any more than with future impunity; the path of disobedience is obstructed, if not rendered impassable; and wherever he turns his eyes he beholds the sword of divine justice stretched out to intercept his passage. Guilt will be appalled, conscience alarmed, and the fruits of unlawful gratification embittered to his taste.

It is surely desirable to place as many obstacles as possible in the path of ruin: to take care that the image of death shall meet the offender at every turn; that he shall not be able to persist without treading upon briars and scorpions, without forcing his way through obstructions more formidable than he can expect to meet with in a contrary course. If you can enlist the nobler part of his nature under the banners of virtue, set him at war with himself, and subject him to the necessity, should he persevere, of stifling and overcoming whatever is most characteristic of a reasonable creature, you have done what will probably not be unproductive of advantage. If he be at the same time reminded, by his acquaintance with the Word of God, of a better state of mind being attainable, a better destiny reserved (provided they are willing and obedient) for the children of men, there is room to hope that, "wearied," to speak in the language of the prophet, "in the greatness of his way," he will bethink himself of the true refuge, and implore the Spirit of grace to aid his weakness, and subdue his corruptions. Sound religious instruction is a perpetual counterpoise to the force of depravity. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes; the fear of the Lord is clean, enduring for ever; the judgments of the Lord are true, and righteous altogether."

While we insist on the absolute necessity of an acquaintance with the Word of God, we are equally convinced it is but an instrument, which, like every other, requires a hand to wield it; and that, important as it is in the order of means, the Spirit of Christ only can make it effectual, which ought therefore to be earnestly and incessantly implored for that purpose. "Open mine eyes," saith the Psalmist, "and I shall behold wonderful things out of Thy law." We trust it will be your care, who have the conduct of the school we are recommending to the patronage of this audience, to impress on these children a deep conviction of their radical corruption, and of the necessity of the agency of the Spirit, to render the knowledge they acquire practical and experimental. "In the morning sow your seed, in the evening withhold not your hand; but remember that neither he that soweth, nor he that watereth, is anything; it is God that giveth the increase." Be not satisfied with making them read a lesson, or repeat a prayer. By everything tender and solemn in religion, by a due admixture of the awful considerations drawn from the prospects of death and judgment, with others of a more pleasing nature, aim to fix serious impressions on their hearts. Aim to produce a religious concern, carefully watch its progress, and endeavour to conduct it to a prosperous issue. Lead them to the footstool of the Saviour; teach them to rely, as guilty creatures, on His merits alone, and to commit their eternal interests entirely into His hands. Let the salvation of these children be the object to which every word of your instructions, every exertion of your authority, is directed. Despise the profane clamour which would deter you from attempting to render them serious, from an apprehension of its making them melancholy, not doubting for a moment, that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and that the path to true happiness lies through purity, humility, and devotion. Meditate the worth of souls: meditate deeply the lessons the Scriptures afford on their inconceivable value and eternal duration. While the philosopher wearies himself with endless speculations on their physical properties and nature, while the politician only contemplates the social arrangements of mankind and the shifting forms of policy, fix *your* attention on the individual importance of man, as the creature of God, and a candidate for immortality. Let it be your highest ambition to train up these children for an unchanging condition of being. Spare no pains to recover them to the image of God; render familiar to their minds, in all its extent, the various branches of that *holiness* without which "none shall see the Lord." Inculcate the obligation, and endeavour to inspire the love of that rectitude, that eternal rectitude, which was with God before time began, was embodied in the person of His Son, and in its lower communications, will survive every sublunary change, emerge in the dissolution of all things, and be impressed, in refulgent characters, on the new heavens and the new earth, "in which dwelleth righteousness." Pray often with them, and for them, and remind them of the inconceivable advantages attached to that exercise. Accustom them to a punctual and reverential attendance at the house of God: insist on the sanctification of the Sabbath, by such a disposal of time as is suitable to a day of rest and devotion. Survey them with a vigilant and tender eye, checking every appearance of an evil and depraved disposition the moment it springs up, and encouraging the dawn of piety and virtue.

By thus "training them up in the way they should go," you may reasonably hope that "when old, they will not depart from it."

We congratulate the nation on the extent of the efforts employed, and the means set on foot, for the improvement of the lower classes, and especially the children of the poor, in moral and religious knowledge, from which we hope much good will accrue, not only to the parties concerned, but to the kingdom at large. These are the likeliest, or rather, the only expedients that can be adopted, for forming a sound and virtuous populace; and if there be any truth in the figure by which society is compared to a pyramid, it is on them its stability chiefly depends: the elaborate ornament at the top will be a wretched compensation for the want of solidity in the lower parts of the structure. These are not the times in which it is safe for a nation to repose on the lap of ignorance. If there ever was a season when public tranquillity was ensured by the absence of knowledge, that season is past. The convulsed state of the world will not permit unthinking stupidity to sleep, without being appalled by phantoms, and shaken by terrors, to which reason, which defines her objects, and limits her apprehension, by the reality of things is a stranger. Everything in the condition of mankind announces the approach of some great crisis, for which nothing can prepare us but the diffusion of knowledge, probity, and the fear of the Lord. While the world is impelled, with such violence, in opposite directions; while a spirit of giddiness and revolt is shed upon the nations, and the seeds of mutation are so thickly sown, the improvement of the mass of the people will be our grand security; in the neglect of which, the politeness, the refinement, and the knowledge accumulated in the higher orders, weak and unprotected, will be exposed to imminent danger, and perish like a garland in the grasp of popular fury. "Wisdom and knowledge shall be the stability of thy times, and strength of salvation; the fear of the Lord is His treasure."

ON THE THREATENED INVASION OF BRITAIN BY THE FRENCH IN 1803.

By a series of criminal enterprises, by the success of guilty ambition, the liberties of Europe have been gradually extinguished. The subjugation of Holland, of Switzerland, and the free towns of Germany, has completed that catastrophe; and we are the only people in the eastern hemisphere who are in possession of equal laws and a free constitution. Freedom, driven from every spot on the continent, has sought an asylum in the country she always chose for her favourite abode; but she is pursued even here, and threatened with destruction. The inundation of lawless power, after covering the whole earth, threatens to follow us here. We are most exactly, most critically placed in the only aperture where it can be successfully repelled—in the Thermopylæ of the world. As far as the interests of freedom are concerned—the most important by far of sublunary interests—you, my countrymen, stand in the capacity of the representatives of the human race; for you it is to determine—under God—in what condition the latest posterity shall be born. Their fortunes are entrusted to your care; on your conduct, at this moment, depend the colour and complexion of their destiny. If liberty, extinguished on the Continent, be suffered to expire here, whence is it ever to emerge from the midst of that thick night which will invest it? It remains with you, then, to decide whether that freedom, at whose voice the kingdoms of Europe awoke from the sleep of ages, to run a career of virtuous emulation in everything great and good—that freedom which dispelled the mists of superstition, and invited the nations to behold their God, and whose magic torch kindled the rays of genius, the enthusiasm of poetry, and the flame of eloquence—that freedom which poured into our lap opulence and arts, and embellished life with innumerable institutions and improvements, till it became a theatre of wonders; it is for you to decide whether that freedom shall yet survive, or be covered with a funeral pall and be wrapped in eternal gloom.

It is not necessary to await your determination. In the solicitude you feel to approve yourselves worthy of such a trust, every thought of what is afflicting in warfare, every apprehension of danger, must vanish; you are impatient to mingle in the battle of the civilised world. Go then, ye defenders of your country, accompanied by every auspicious omen; advance with alacrity into the field, where God himself musters the host to war. Religion is too much interested in your success not to lend you her aid. She will shed over this enterprise her selectest influence. While you are engaged in the field, many will repair to the closet, many to the sanctuary. The faithful of every name will employ that prayer which has power with God. The feeble hand, unequal to any other weapon, will grasp the sword of the Spirit; from myriads of humble, contrite hearts, the voice of intercession, supplication, and weeping, will mingle, in its ascent to heaven, with the shouts of battle and the shock of arms.

The extent of your resources, under God, is equal to the justice of your cause. But should Providence determine otherwise, should you fall in this struggle—should the nation fall—you will have the satisfaction—the purest allotted to man—of having performed your part; your names will be enrolled with the most illustrious dead, while posterity to the end of time, as often as they revolve the deeds of this period—and they will incessantly revolve them—will

turn to you a reverential eye, while they mourn over the freedom entombed in your sepulchre.

I cannot but imagine that the virtuous heroes, legislators, and patriots, of every age and country, are bending from their elevated seats to witness this contest, as if they were incapable, till it be brought to a favourable issue, of enjoying their eternal repose. Enjoy that repose, illustrious mortals! Your mantle fell when you ascended; and thousands, inflamed by your spirit, and impatient to tread in your steps, are ready to swear by Him that sitteth upon the throne and liveth for ever and ever, that they will protect freedom in her last asylum, and never desert that cause which you sustained by your labours and cemented with your blood. And Thou, sole Ruler of the children of men, to whom the shields of the earth belong, gird on Thy sword, Thou Most Mighty! Go forth with our hosts in the day of battle! Impart, in addition to their hereditary valour, that confidence of success which springs from Thy presence! Pour into their hearts the spirits of departed heroes! Inspire them with valour; and, while led by Thy hand and fighting under Thy banners, open Thou their eyes to behold in every valley and on every plain what the prophet beheld by the same illumination—chariots of fire and horses of fire! Then shall the strong man be as tow, and the maker of it as a spark; they shall both burn together and none shall quench them.

WILLIAM COBBETT.

1762-1835.

ON REFORM AND REFORMERS.

A FEW years ago, that is in 1816, Lord Milton said, in the House of Commons, that he should like to come to close quarters with the reformers —I suppose he had some fellow to do with who was not very troublesome—but he said he should like to come to close quarters with the reformers. Gentlemen, the time has arrived when he may come to close quarters with them. But, how did he show his inclination? Why, in the first place, in the very next year he might have come to close quarters, but what did he do? Why, when a million and a half of petitions were presented for reform, my Lord Milton answered their arguments by voting for a gagging bill, and his father for a gagging bill and a dungeon bill too. That was the way he came to close quarters, then; and now, when there is a prospect of close quarters again, he shows his boldness, and his propensity to grapple with the reformers, by slinking away from the county of Yorkshire, and creeping in for a rotten borough. Oh, yes, my Lord Milton was not going to face thousands of men, whom he must have faced had he sought to be re-elected; depend upon it, he is so strongly disposed to come to close quarters with the reformers that he would prefer to walk quietly in for a rotten borough—the place lately filled by the Attorney-General, and leaves Yorkshire to be filled by the lawyer Brougham. Gentlemen, you see his desire was not to come to close quarters with the reformers, but to get out of the way; not to be so prominent in the House as before, but to put forward a talking lawyer, who has talent to wheedle the people, and make them believe that they have got somewhat nearer the mark than before, in consequence of his election. It is therefore of the greatest importance that we take a view of this lawyer and his party, for they will be armed against the duke. Gentlemen, we shall have the duke [the Duke of Wellington] with us, if we behave with becoming spirit.

Gentlemen, we shall have the Whigs, as they call themselves, and very properly, too, arrayed against the duke, trying to prevent that which he may be disposed to give to us from being efficient for our good. Let me then call your attention to this faction of pretended patriots, pretended lovers of liberty, friends of the people, for unless we be on our guard against them, we shall be cheated at last, and the day of our deliverance be deferred. Look at their conduct, then. This faction has succeeded in deceiving the people for a long while, and it still has its hold upon the minds and affections of some. What pretension has this faction, then, to patriotism and friendship for the people? In the first place, they made the national debt, and all the evils arising out of it; they passed the Septennial Bill; they made the excise laws, and when they came into power, they passed every odious law. In the plenitude of their power, in 1806, the first thing they did was to add to the number of German troops in the country; the second thing was to pass a law enabling Lord Grenville to unite in his own person the two offices of First Lord of the Treasury and Auditor of the Exchequer, that he might receive £12,000 a year of the public money. This really seemed to be a measure of impossi-

bility—to give a man £4000 a year for auditing *his own accounts*—to be so incongruous, that it was, as the poet says, making impossibilities coalesce. The next thing they did was—not to propose excise laws, for those they had passed long before—but it was to propose a law by Lord Henry Petty, now the Marquis of Lansdowne, to bring the exciseman into every private house; to lay a tax upon the beer brewed by any man for his own consumption. So that an Englishman's house would have been his castle with a vengeance, if that law had passed. We complain of the Tories pressing us down with taxes, but they have never, though bad enough, God knows, they have never been half so bad as the others. The Whigs say they are for retrenchment and economy; how did they show that in the income tax which they created? that most unjust of all taxes. They laid a tax of 10 per cent. on all property, as they called it, including in it every tradesman, and making him, in fact, pay seven times as much as the lord. At the same time they passed a law to augment the incomes of the royal family, and relieve them from the operation of the property tax. Yes, and they did more; for the law under which that family reigns—the law of settlement—stipulates positively and absolutely that no foreigner shall enjoy any pension or place of emolument under the Crown, but these Whigs appointed scores of foreigners, who are on the pension list to this day. Gentlemen, the Tories, bad as they are, never committed such indecencies as these. And how have these same men acted recently. They have now and then had a pretty little motion for Parliamentary reform—such as my Lord John Russell's scheme. But in 1827 mark their conduct. At that time Canning came into power, and he made a kind of coalition with them: he who had opposed the reformers all his lifetime, though he had taken £150,000 of our money. Well, they amalgamated with him. Oh, yes, they would all support the right honourable gentleman. To be sure, because he had got places and pensions to bestow. Brougham, you recollect, thought to get made Master of the Rolls, and Lord John Russell was, perhaps, to have been made an ambassador. One night when the House was sitting (for they do all their work by owl-light)—one night Mr Peel asked how the honourable gentlemen, who had taken their seats on the Treasury benches, would agree with one another on the question of Parliamentary reform. Canning got up and said he would oppose reform in that House to the last moment of his life, let it come in what shape it might. Very well, that was all very well and very consistent in Canning, but how did the Whigs act? Why, Lord John Russell, who had a notice of motion for reform before the House, got up, and said he had discovered the people did not want reform now, and therefore he should beg to withdraw his motion. Ay, and Brougham supported him. He said that the people for some years now had not wished for any such thing as Parliamentary reform; therefore he would support his right honourable friend, notwithstanding that he objected to Parliamentary reform. Burdett, too, said he would support the right honourable gentleman, notwithstanding his declaration. That, then, was their conduct in 1827, only three years ago; and is any one to believe—is any man so foolish as to believe—that they are now sincere when they talk about reform? All of them, however, dislike the ballot, and for the reasons I have upon a former occasion had the honour to state to you—because they know that it would be the great security of the independence of the people. This, gentlemen, will be their conduct, and against that we must be upon our guard. If we be not, we shall be cheated with some shuffling thing. My idea is, that the duke may come to the House and propose a national kind of reform. Not a wild and visionary reform; oh, no, to be sure not. Our answer will be: "No, my lord duke, we are for nothing wild and visionary, we only want that every man able to carry a musket should have a vote, if he be in his senses, and be not tainted by indelible crime; we want this, because our bodies are liable to be forced out in defence of your estates, my lord duke, if they should be placed in danger. Then we want that Parliaments should be shorter, because we perceive that the members grow very slack in their duties in the course of seven years, until they are just on the eve of an election. Twelve years is the average of a man's life, and therefore we think that seven years is too long for which to return a member to Parliament. And then we want the ballot, because of many things; among the rest because it would put an end to canvassing and bribery; and all those infamies which are practised once in about four or five years. We want, my lord duke, to put an end to this infamy, and if you call this wild and visionary—if you, who belong to three or four Bible societies—call it wild and visionary to put an end to that bribery and perjury which God has denounced and held up to execration—if you call this wild and visionary, my lord duke, we can only say that we have not the same dictionary to explain our words by." Gentlemen, if you stand to this firmly, let them go on with their projects; they may pass a law—and it would not be right to resist it; let us see the operation of it first. But this is the course I think the thing will take after they have been discussing parliamentary reform for some time; some man among them will get up, and will have the honesty and the boldness to make a point of the *ballot*. "There," he will say, "all the people understand that; give them the ballot." Yes, gentlemen, William IV. and the ballot, all the world over! And my opinion is,

that when that comes to be discussed, if the man who brings it forward be in earnest, it will come to be—the ballot or nothing. When that question comes to be decided, they will have 200,000 voters waiting the result of the decision. They will not regard it with indifference; they will feel their own existence to be at stake. And thus I hope we shall get the thing we seek without disturbances or bloodshed. That we may do this, is, I am sure, my sincere wish; and it has been the whole endeavour of my life to cause it to take place in my country.

EARL GREY.

1764-1845.

ON MOVING THE SECOND READING OF THE REFORM BILL, 1832.

I HAVE now brought to a conclusion all that I think it necessary to address to you on this occasion. Much that relates to the general character of the measure, and to the circumstances in which his Majesty's ministers thought it incumbent on them to introduce it, I have left untouched, as having been fully and repeatedly discussed on former occasions. Much even that relates to the details of the present bill I fear I may have omitted, or explained too imperfectly. But these deficiencies may be supplied by others, in the course even of this debate; and even to me I trust the House will allow the opportunity, at the end of the debate, which is usually given to those who introduce an important question, of adding anything that I may find necessary. But full and ample opportunity will be afforded for this purpose in the committee, if, as I undoubtedly hope and believe it will, the motion now awaiting your decision should receive your Lordships' assent. I look, I say, to this decision with hope approaching to confidence, but not without anxiety, for I know all that depends upon it to the country, to this House, and to myself.

We have not heard lately of reaction, but I am not without fear that there may be some who may think that the general silence now prevailing betokens some diminution of the deep interest—of the intense earnestness with which the public is looking to the issue of this night's debate. If such be their impression, I am convinced that they will find that it is unfounded. If there have been no petitions, let it not be supposed that this proceeds from any diminished feeling in favour of the object, for which, during the progress of the former bill, petitions were so numerously addressed to this House. I fear, rather, that the cause is to be found in a diminished hope that such applications here will be successful—from an increasing persuasion that we do not sympathise with the people—from a prevailing belief that our own separate interests are more considered by us than those of the people at large. Such a belief, I am sure, is erroneous, and I trust it will receive a satisfactory contradiction from the vote of this night.

I have been accused of using the language of intimidation. Such, my Lords, is not my intention; but surely it is not to threaten if I offer the advice which any honest counsellor would submit to the most absolute monarch, that there is no station, no rank, no dignity, no authority, no power, which can safely disregard public opinion. I counsel you not to yield to a temporary—a passing impulse, or to the impetuosity of unreflecting clamour. But I do counsel, nay, I entreat you, to consult the general feeling of the public, which, when strongly, when generally, and perseveringly, and uniformly expressed, as it has now been, upon any subject which they have had full opportunity to consider and to examine, is entitled to attention, and, let me add, to respect. Such an expression of public feeling will not, I trust, be met with a harsh rejection of the measure on which it is fixed, but with a kind, and—may I not say without offence—prudent consideration of that measure in a committee, where—the principle, to a greater or less extent, being almost universally admitted—its details may be fully canvassed and discussed. So let me entreat your Lordships to a compliance with the public and general desire; do not convert what is now suspended hope into absolute and irremediable despair.

I have throughout endeavoured not to say one word which could excite angry feelings, or add excitement to—I wish I could say—dying animosities. If I have done so, I disclaim it, as being most remote from my intention, and ask pardon for it. But let me entreat you well to weigh and to consider what may be the effect of a rejection of this bill. You have seen, and you have felt, how much the public interests have been affected by the long-continued anxiety and suspense in which the public mind has been held—how much its commercial transactions, its domestic interests, its foreign relations, have all sustained injury, more or less. For this I

SRI PRATAP COLLEGE LIBRARY
SRINAGAR

maintain that the king's ministers are not to blame; and I do not impute it as blame to those who have opposed them. It was, perhaps, the unavoidable consequence of conflicting opinions on a great measure of constitutional policy. But that these consequences have taken place is certain; and it must be equally the desire, as it is the interest of us all, to put an end to a state of things so embarrassing and so afflicting. You have now an opportunity of doing so, which, if lost, it may be difficult to recover. But if you reject the bill, what will be the consequence? Will the question be set at rest? The acknowledgment of all, even of those who have been most opposed to this bill, that a reform is necessary—still more, the undiminished force of public opinion—show this to be impossible. If this bill is not allowed to go into committee, another—let who will be ministers—must be introduced. Then follows another period of suspense and agitation, exempt, I trust, from violence and tumult, but still most prejudicial to the interests and to the tranquillity of the country.

My Lords, I forbear to press further the consequences of a second rejection; what I have said is enough to induce you to weigh well those which I have pointed out, which are sufficiently serious to demand the most anxious reflection. To the country, and to your Lordships, therefore, the result of this night is important in a degree scarcely paralleled in your records as a legislative assembly. To myself, everything depends upon it. I knew all the difficulties to which I exposed myself when I undertook this measure—a sense of the duty which I owed to my sovereign and my country commanded me to brave them.

Having introduced the measure, I have endeavoured to conduct it through the various embarrassments with which it was beset, with a steady adherence to its principles, and to the views upon which I had originally acted. I have been exposed to much injustice—to many, I will confidently say, undeserved attacks—to much misrepresentation; and, I must add, to much suspicion, from which I should have thought I might have been protected. But I have not been deterred from doing what I thought right, or allowed myself to be forced and driven into any measures, which, while a hope existed, I could not approve. I have felt, I say, the attacks to which I have been exposed, and I know what further I have to expect. In the event of its failure, a personal responsibility rests upon me, which, perhaps, never was before sustained by any former minister. I may sink under it—that is nothing; I shall have the support of an approving conscience, which has always instructed me to do what is right, and to leave the consequences to God. What I pray for is, that I may be the only victim, and that the consequences of my failure may affect neither the prosperity nor the peace of my country, nor that union between your Lordships and the people on which the welfare of both—and what is necessary to the welfare of both, your Lordships' authority, and character, and usefulness—essentially depend. I now move that this bill be read a second time.

LORD PLUNKET.

1764-1854.

ON THE PROSECUTION OF EMMETT, 1803.

LIBERTY and equality are dangerous names to make use of; if properly understood, they mean enjoyment of personal freedom under the equal protection of the laws; and a genuine love of liberty inculcates a friendship for our friends, our king, and country—a reverence for their lives, an anxiety for their safety; a feeling which advances from private to public life, until it expands and swells into the more dignified name of philanthropy and philosophy. But in the cant of modern philosophy these affections, which form the ennobling distinctions of man's nature, are all thrown aside; all the vices of his character are made the instrument of moral good—an abstract quantity of vice may produce a certain quantity of moral good. In a man whose principles are thus poisoned and his judgment perverted, the most flagitious crimes lose their names, robbery and murder become moral good. He is taught not to startle at putting to death a fellow-creature, if it be represented as a mode of contributing to the good of all. In pursuit of those phantoms and chimeras of the brain, they abolish feelings and instincts which God and nature have planted in our hearts for the good of human kind. Thus, by the printed plan for the establishment of liberty and a free republic, murder is prohibited and proscribed; and yet you heard how this caution against excesses was followed up by the recital of every grievance that ever existed, and which could excite every bad feeling of the heart, the most vengeful cruelty and insatiate thirst of blood.

Gentlemen, I am anxious to suppose that the mind of the prisoner recoiled at the scenes of

murder which he witnessed, and I mention one circumstance with satisfaction—it appears he saved the life of Farrell; and may the recollection of that one good action cheer him in his last moments! But, though he may not have planned individual murders, there is no excuse to justify his embarking in treason which must be followed by every species of crimes. It is supported by the rabble of the country, while the rank, the wealth, and the power of the country are opposed to it. Let loose the rabble of the country from the salutary restraints of the law, and who can take upon him to limit their barbarities? Who can say he will disturb the peace of the world, and rule it when wildest? Let loose the winds of heaven, and what power less than omnipotent can control them? So it is with the rabble; let them loose, and who can restrain them? What claim, then, can the prisoner have upon the compassion of a jury, because, in the general destruction which his schemes necessarily produce, he did not meditate individual murder? In the short space of a quarter of an hour, what a scene of blood and horror was exhibited! I trust that the blood which has been shed in the streets of Dublin upon that night, and since upon the scaffold, and which may hereafter be shed, will not be visited upon the head of the prisoner. It is not for me to say what are the limits of the mercy of God, or what a sincere repentance of those crimes may effect; but I do say, that if this unfortunate young gentleman retains any of the seeds of humanity in his heart, or possesses any of those qualities which a virtuous education in a liberal seminary must have planted in his bosom, he will make an atonement to his God and his country, by employing whatever time remains to him in warning his deluded countrymen from persevering in their schemes. Much blood has been shed, and he perhaps would have been immolated by his followers if he had succeeded. They are a bloodthirsty crew, incapable of listening to the voice of reason, and equally incapable of obtaining rational freedom, if it were wanting in this country, as they are of enjoying it. They imbrue their hands in the most sacred blood of the country, and yet they call upon God to prosper their cause, as it is just! but, as it is atrocious, wicked, and abominable, I most devoutly invoke that God to confound and overwhelm it.

SIR JAMES MACKINTOSH.

1765-1832.

DEFENCE OF JEAN PELTIER,* 1803.

THERE is one point of view in which this case seems to me to merit your most serious attention. I consider it as the first of a long series of conflicts between the greatest power in the world and the only free press remaining in Europe. No man living is more thoroughly convinced than I am that my learned friend, Mr Attorney-General, will never degrade his excellent character; that he will never disgrace his high magistracy by mean compliances, by an immoderate and unconscientious exercise of power; yet I am convinced, by circumstances which I shall now abstain from discussing, that I am to consider this as the first of a long series of conflicts between the greatest power in the world and the only free press now remaining in Europe. Gentlemen, this distinction of the English press is new; it is a proud and melancholy distinction. Before the great earthquake of the French Revolution had swallowed up all the asylums of free discussion on the Continent, we enjoyed that privilege, indeed, more fully than others; but we did not enjoy it exclusively. In great monarchies, the press has always been considered as too formidable an engine to be entrusted to unlicensed individuals. But in other Continental countries, either by the laws of the state, or by long habits of liberality and toleration in magistrates, a liberty of discussion has been enjoyed, perhaps sufficient for most useful purposes. It existed, in fact, where it was not protected by law; and the wise and generous connivance of governments was daily more and more secured by the growing civilisation of their subjects. In Holland, in Switzerland, in the imperial towns of Germany, the press was either legally or practically free. Holland and Switzerland are no more; and since the commencement of this prosecution, fifty imperial towns have been erased from the list of independent states by one dash of the pen. Three or four still preserve a precarious and trembling existence. I will not say by what compliances they must purchase its continuance. I will not insult the feebleness of states, whose unmerited fall I do most bitterly deplore.

* Peltier was editor of *L'Ambigu*, a French newspaper published in London, intended to expose the *ambiguous* conduct of Napoleon Bonaparte. He was tried for libel, at the instigation of the emperor himself, who took advantage of the peace subsisting between Britain and France. The above is part of the speech delivered in his defence in the Court of King's Bench, 21st February 1803. Peltier was found guilty by the jury, but as war broke out immediately, sentence was never passed upon him.

These governments were in many respects one of the most interesting parts of the ancient system of Europe. Unfortunately for the repose of mankind, great states are compelled, by regard to their own safety, to consider the military spirit and martial habits of their people as one of the main objects of their policy. Frequent hostilities seem almost the necessary condition of their greatness; and, without being great, they cannot long remain safe. Smaller states exempted from this cruel necessity—a hard condition of greatness, a bitter satire on human nature—devoted themselves to the arts of peace, to the cultivation of literature, and the improvement of reason. They became places of refuge for free and fearless discussion; they were the impartial spectators and judges of the various contests of ambition which from time to time disturbed the quiet of the world. They thus became peculiarly qualified to be the organs of that public opinion which converted Europe into a great republic, with laws which mitigated, though they could not extinguish ambition; and with moral tribunals to which even the most despotic sovereigns were amenable. If wars of aggrandisement were undertaken, their authors were arraigned in the face of Europe. If acts of internal tyranny were perpetrated, they resounded from a thousand presses throughout all civilised countries. Princes on whose will there were no legal checks, thus found a moral restraint which the most powerful of them could not brave with absolute impunity. They acted before a vast audience, to whose applause or condemnation they could not be utterly indifferent. The very constitution of human nature, the unalterable laws of the mind of man, against which all rebellion is fruitless, subjected the proudest tyrants to this control. No elevation of power, no depravity, however consummate, no innocence, however spotless, can render man wholly independent of the praise or blame of his fellowmen.

These governments were, in other respects, one of the most beautiful and interesting parts of our ancient system. The perfect security of such inconsiderable and feeble states, their undisturbed tranquillity amid the wars and conquests that surrounded them, attested, beyond any other part of the European system, the moderation, the justice, the civilisation to which Christian Europe had reached in modern times. Their weakness was protected only by the habitual reverence for justice, which, during a long series of ages, had grown up in Christendom. This was the only fortification which defended them against those mighty monarchs to whom they offered so easy a prey. And till the French Revolution, this was sufficient. Consider, for instance, the situation of the republic of Geneva. Think of her defenceless position, in the very jaws of France; but think also of her undisturbed security, of her profound quiet, of the brilliant success with which she applied to industry and literature, while Louis XIV. was pouring his myriads into Italy before her gates. Call to mind, if ages crowded into years have not effaced them from your memory, that happy period when we scarcely dreamed more of the subjugation of the feeblest republic of Europe than of the conquest of her mightiest empire; and tell me, if you can imagine a spectacle more beautiful to the moral eye, or a more striking proof of progress in the noblest principles of true civilisation.

These feeble states—these monuments of the justice of Europe—the asylum of peace, of industry, and of literature—the organs of public reason—the refuge of oppressed innocence and persecuted truth—have perished with those ancient principles which were their sole guardians and protectors. They have been swallowed up by that fearful convulsion which has shaken the uttermost corners of the earth. They are destroyed and gone for ever.

One asylum of free discussion is still inviolate. There is still one spot in Europe where man can freely exercise his reason on the most important concerns of society, where he can boldly publish his judgment on the acts of the proudest and most powerful tyrants. The press of England is still free. It is guarded by the free constitution of our forefathers. It is guarded by the hearts and arms of Englishmen, and I trust I may venture to say that if it be to fall, it will fall only under the ruins of the British empire.

It is an awful consideration, gentlemen. Every other monument of European liberty has perished. That ancient fabric which has been gradually reared by the wisdom and virtue of our fathers still stands. It stands, thanks be to God! solid and entire; but it stands alone, and it stands amid ruins.

In these extraordinary circumstances, I repeat that I must consider this as the first of a long series of conflicts between the greatest power in the world and the only free press remaining in Europe. And I trust that you will consider yourselves as the advanced guard of liberty, as having this day to fight the first battle of free discussion against the most formidable enemy that it ever encountered.

CHARACTER OF CHARLES J. FOX.

Mr Fox united in a most remarkable degree the seemingly repugnant characters of the mildest of men and the most vehement of orators. In private life he was gentle, modest, placable, kind; of simple manners, and so averse from parade and dogmatism as to be not only unostentatious, but even somewhat inactive in conversation. His superiority was never felt but in the instruction which he imparted, or in the attention which his generous preference usually directed to the more obscure members of the company. The simplicity of his manners was far from excluding that perfect urbanity and amenity which

flowed still more from the mildness of his nature than from familiar intercourse with the most polished society of Europe. His conversation, when it was not repressed by modesty or indolence, was delightful. The pleasantry, perhaps, of no man of wit had so unlaboured an appearance. It seemed rather to escape from his mind than to be produced by it. He had lived on the most intimate terms with all his contemporaries, distinguished by wit, politeness, philosophy, learning, or the talents of public life. In the course of thirty years he had known almost every man in Europe whose intercourse could strengthen, or enrich, or polish the mind. His own literature was various and elegant. In classical erudition, which, by the custom of England, is more peculiarly called learning, he was inferior to few professed scholars. Like all men of genius, he delighted to take refuge in poetry from the vulgarity and irritation of business. The character of his mind was displayed in his extraordinary partiality for the poetry of the two most poetical nations or, at least, languages of the west—those of the Greeks and of the Italians. He disliked political conversation, and never willingly took any part in it.

To speak of him justly as an orator would require a long essay. Everywhere natural, he carried into public something of that simple and negligent exterior which belonged to him in private. When he began to speak, a common observer might have thought him awkward; and even a consummate judge could only have been struck with the exquisite justness of his ideas, and the transparent simplicity of his manners. But no sooner had he spoken for some time than he was changed into another being. He forgot himself and everything around him. He thought only of his subject. His genius warmed, and kindled as he went on. He darted fire into his audience. Torrents of impetuous and irresistible eloquence swept along their feelings and conviction. He certainly possessed above all moderns that union of reason, simplicity, and vehemence which formed the prince of orators. He was the most Demosthenean speaker since Demosthenes. "I knew him," says Mr Burke, in a pamphlet written after their unhappy difference, "when he was nineteen; since which time he has risen, by slow degrees, to be the most brilliant and accomplished debater that the world ever saw." The quiet dignity of a mind roused only by great objects, the absence of petty bustle, the contempt of show, the abhorrence of intrigue, the plainness and downrightness, and the thorough good-nature which distinguished Mr Fox, seem to render him no very unfit representative of that old English national character which, if it ever changed, we should be sanguine indeed to expect to see succeeded by a better. The simplicity of his character inspired confidence, the ardour of his eloquence roused enthusiasm, and the gentleness of his manners invited friendship. "I admired," says Mr Gibbon, "the powers of a superior man, as they are blended in his attractive character, with all the softness and simplicity of a child; no human being was ever more free from any taint of malignity, vanity, or falsehood." From these qualities of his public and private character, it probably arose that no English statesman ever preserved, during so long a period of adverse fortunes, so many affectionate friends and so many zealous adherents. The union of ardour in public sentiment, with mildness in social manner, was in Mr Fox an hereditary quality. The same fascinating power over the attachment of all who came within his sphere is said to have belonged to his father; and those who know the survivors of another generation will feel that this delightful quality is not yet extinct in the race.

Perhaps nothing can more strongly prove the deep impression made by this part of Mr Fox's character than the words of Mr Burke, who, in January 1797, six years after all intercourse between them had ceased, speaking to a person honoured with some degree of Mr Fox's friendship, said, "To be sure, he is a man made to be loved!" and these emphatical words were uttered with a fervour of manner which left no doubt of their heartfelt sincerity.

These few hasty and honest sentences are sketched in a temper too sober and serious for intentional exaggeration, and with too pious an affection for the memory of Mr Fox, to profane it by intermixture with the factious brawls and wrangles of the day. His political conduct belongs to history. The measures which he supported or opposed may divide the opinion of posterity, as they have divided those of the present age. But he will most certainly command the unanimous reverence of future generations by his pure sentiments toward the commonwealth, by his zeal for the civil and religious rights of all men, by his liberal principles favourable to mild government, to the unfettered exercise of the human faculties, and the progressive civilisation of mankind; by his ardent love for a country, of which the well-being and greatness were, indeed, inseparable from his own glory, and by his profound reverence for that free constitution which he was universally admitted to understand better than any other man of his age, both in an exactly legal and a comprehensively philosophical sense.

GEORGE CANNING.

1770-1827.

THE FALL OF BONAPARTE.*

GENTLEMEN, as your guest, I thank you from my heart for the honourable and affectionate reception which you have given me. As the representative of Liverpool, I am most happy in meeting my constituents again, after a year's experience of each other, and a year's separation; a year, the most eventful in the annals of the world, and comprising within itself such a series of stupendous changes as might have filled the history of an age.

Gentlemen, you have been so good as to couple with my name the expression of your acknowledgments for the attention which I have paid to the interests of your town. You, gentlemen, I have no doubt, recollect the terms upon which I entered into your service; and you are aware, therefore, that I claim no particular acknowledgment at your hands for attention to the interests of Liverpool, implicated as they are with the general interests of the country. I trust, at the same time, that I have not been wanting to all or to any of you in matters of local or individual concern. But I should not do fairly by you, if I were not to take this opportunity of saying that a service (which certainly I will not pretend to describe as without some burden in itself) has been made light to me, beyond all example, by that institution which your munificence and provident care have established: I mean the office in London, through which your correspondence with your members is now carried on. I had no pretension, gentlemen, to this singular mark of your consideration; but neither will it, I hope, be thought presumptuous in me to confess, that I might not have been able to discharge the service which I owe you, in a way which would have satisfied my own feelings as well as yours—that I might, in spite of all my endeavours, have been guilty of occasional omissions, if I had not been provided with some such medium of communication with my constituents. Of an absent and meritorious individual, it is as pleasing as it is just to speak well; and I do no more than justice to the gentleman [Mr John Backhouse] whom you have appointed to conduct the office in question (with whom I had no previous acquaintance), in bearing public testimony to his merit, and in assuring you that it would be difficult to find any one who would surpass him in zeal, intelligence, and industry.

Having despatched what it was necessary for me to say on these points, I know, gentlemen, that it is your wish, and I feel it to be my duty, that I should now proceed to communicate to you my sentiments on the state of public affairs, with the same frankness which has hitherto distinguished all our intercourse with each other. That duty is one which it does not now require any effort of courage to perform. To exhort to sacrifices, to stimulate to exertion, to shame despondency, to divert from untimely concession, is a duty of a sterner sort, which you found me not backward to discharge, at a period when, from the shortness of our acquaintance, I was uncertain whether my freedom might not offend you. My task of to-day is one at which no man can take offence. It is to mingle my congratulations with your rejoicings on the events which have passed and are passing in the world.

If, in contemplating events so widely (I had almost said so tremendously) important, it be pardonable to turn one's view for a moment to local and partial considerations, I may be permitted to observe, that, while to Great Britain, while to all Europe, while to the world and to posterity, the events which have recently taken place are matter of unbounded and universal joy, there is no collection of individuals who are better entitled than the company now assembled in this room (in great part, I presume, identically the same, and altogether representing the same interests and feelings as that of which I took leave, in this room, about fourteen months ago) to exult in the present state of things, and to derive from it, in addition to their share of the general joy, a distinct and special satisfaction.

We cannot forget, gentlemen, the sinister omens and awful predictions under which we met and parted in October 1812. The penalty denounced upon you for your election of me was embarrassment to the rich and famine to the poor. I was warned that, when I should return to renew my acquaintance with my constituents, I should find the grass growing in your streets. In spite of that denunciation, you did me the honour to elect me; in spite of that warning, I venture to meet you here again. It must be fairly confessed that this is not the season of the year to estimate correctly the amount of superfluous and unprofitable vegetation with which your streets may be teeming; but, without presuming to limit the power of productive nature, it is at least satisfactory to know that the fields have not been starved to clothe your quays with verdure; that it is not by economising in the scantiness of the harvest that nature has reserved her vigour for the pastures of your Exchange.

But, gentlemen, I am sure you feel, with me,

* A speech delivered at Liverpool, January 10, 1814.

that these are topics which I treat with levity only because they are not, nor were, at the time when they were seriously urged, susceptible of a serious argument; they did not furnish grounds on which any man would rest his appeal to your favour, or on which your choice of any man could be justified. If I have condescended to revert to them at all, it is because I would leave none of those recollections untouched which the comparison of our last meeting with the present, I know, suggests to your minds as well as my own; and because I would, so far as in me lies, endeavour to banish from all future use, by exposing their absurdity, topics which are calculated only to mislead and to inflame. That the seasons would have run their appointed course, that the sun would have shone with as genial a warmth, and the showers would have fallen with as fertilising a moisture, if you had not chosen me for your representative, is an admission which I make without much apprehension of the consequence. Nor do I wish you to believe that your choice of any other than me would have delayed the return of your prosperity, or prevented the revival of your commerce.

I make these admissions without fear, so far as concerns the choice between individuals. But I do not admit that it was equally indifferent upon what principles that choice should be determined. I do not admit, that if the principles which it was then recommended to you to countenance had unfortunately prevailed in Parliament, and, through the authority of Parliament, had been introduced into the counsels of the country, they would not have interfered with fatal operation, not indeed to arrest the bounty of Providence, to turn back the course of the seasons, and to blast the fertility of the earth, but to stop that current of political events which, "taken at the flood," has placed England at the head of the world.

Gentlemen, if I had met you here again on this day in a state of public affairs as doubtful as that in which we took leave of each other; if confederated nations had been still arrayed against this country, and the balance of Europe still trembling in the scale, I should not have hesitated now, as I did not hesitate then, to declare my decided and unalterable opinion, that perseverance, under whatever difficulties, under whatever privations, afforded the only chance of prosperity to you, because the only chance of safety to your country, and the only chance of safety to the country, because the only chance of deliverence to Europe. Gentlemen, I should be ashamed to address you now in the tone of triumph, if I had not addressed you then in that of exhortation. I should be ashamed to appear before you shouting in the train of success, if I had not looked you in the face and encouraged you to patience under difficulties. It is because my acquaintance with you commenced in times of peril and embarrassment, and because I then neither flattered nor deceived you, that I now not only offer to you my congratulations, but put in my claim to yours, on the extinction of that peril, on the termination of that embarrassment, and on the glorious issue to which exertion and endurance have brought that great struggle in which our honour and our happiness were involved.

Gentlemen, during the course of a political life, nearly coeval with the commencement of the war, I have never given one vote, I have never uttered one sentiment, which had not for its object the consummation now happily within our view.

I am not ashamed, and it is not unpleasing or unprofitable, to look back upon the dangers which we have passed, and to compare them with the scene which now lies before us. We behold a country inferior in population to most of her continental neighbours, but multiplying her faculties and resources by her own activity and enterprise, by the vigour of her constitution, and by the good sense of her people; we behold her, after standing up against a formidable foe throughout a contest, in the course of which every one of her allies, and at times all of them together, have fainted and failed—nay, have been driven to combine with the enemy against her—we behold her, at this moment, rallying the nations of Europe to one point, and leading them to decisive victory.

If such a picture were merely the bright vision of speculative philosophy, if it were presented to us in the page of the history of ancient times, it would stir and warm the heart. But, gentlemen, this country is our own; and what must be the feelings which arise, on such a review, in the bosom of every son of that country? What must be the feelings of a community such as I am now addressing, which constitutes no insignificant part of the strength of the nation so described; which has suffered largely in her privations, and may hope to participate proportionably in her reward? What (I may be permitted to add) must be the feelings of one who is chosen to represent that community, and who finds himself in that honourable station at the moment of triumph, only because he discountenanced despair in the moment of despondency?

From the contemplation of a spectacle so mighty and magnificent as this, I should disdain to turn aside to the controversies of party. Of principles, however, it is impossible not to say something; because our triumph would be incomplete, and its blessings might be transient, if we could be led astray by any sophistry; if we could consent, in a sort of compromise of common joy, to forget or to misstate the causes from which that triumph has sprung. All of one mind, I trust and believe we are, in exulting at the success of our country; all of one mind, I trust, we now are throughout this land, in determining to persevere if need be in strenuous exertion to prosecute, and, I hope, to perfect the

great work so happily in progress. But we know that there are some of those who share most heartily in the public exultation, who yet ascribe effects, which happily cannot be disputed, to causes which may justly be denied. No tenderness for disappointed prophecies, gentlemen, ought to induce us thus to disconnect effect and cause. It would lead to errors which might be dangerous, if unwarily adopted and generally received.

We have heard, for instance, that the war has now been successful, because the principles on which the war was undertaken have been renounced; that we are at length blessed with victory, because we have thrown away the banner under which we entered into the contest; that the contest was commenced with one set of principles, but that the issue has been happily brought about by the adoption of another. Gentlemen, I know of no such change. If we have succeeded, it has not been by the renunciation, but by the prosecution of our principles; if we have succeeded, it has not been by adopting new maxims of policy, but by upholding under all varieties of difficulty and discouragement, old, established, inviolable principles of conduct.

We are told that this war has of late become *a war of the people*, and that by the operation of that change alone the power of imperial France has been baffled and overcome. Nations, it is said, have at length made common cause with their sovereigns, in a contest which heretofore had been a contest of sovereigns only. Gentlemen, the fact of the change might be admitted, without therefore admitting the argument. It does not follow that the people were not at all times equally interested in the war (as those who think as I do have always contended that they were), because it may be and must be admitted that the people in many countries were for a time deluded. They who argue against us say that jarring interests have been reconciled. We say that gross delusions have been removed. Both admit the fact that sovereigns and their people *are* identified. But it is for them who contend that this has been effected by change of principles to specify the change. What change of principles or of government has taken place among the nations of Europe? We are the best judges of ourselves—what change has taken place *here*? Is the constitution other than it was when we were told (as we often were told in the bad times) that it was a doubt whether it were worth defending? Is the constitution other than it was when we were warned that peace on any terms must be made, as the only hope of saving it from popular indignation and popular reform?

There is yet another question to be asked. By what power, in what part of the world, has that final blow been struck which has smitten the tyrant to the ground? I suppose, by some enlightened republic; by some recently-regenerated government of pure philanthropy and uncorrupted virtue; I suppose, by some nation which, in the excess of popular freedom, considers even a representative system as defective, unless each individual interferes directly in the national concerns; some nation of enlightened patriots, every man of whom is a politician in the coffee-house, as well as in the senate: I suppose it is from some such government as this that the conqueror of autocrats, the sworn destroyer of monarchical England, has met his doom. I look through the European world, gentlemen, in vain: I find there no such august community. But in another hemisphere I do find such a one, which, no doubt, must be the political David by whom the Goliath of Europe has been brought down. What is the name of that glorious republic, to which the gratitude of Europe is eternally due—which, from its innate hatred to tyranny, has so perseveringly exerted itself to liberate the world, and at last has successfully closed the contest? Alas, gentlemen, such a republic I do indeed find; and I find it enlisted, and (God be thanked!) enlisted alone, under the banner of the despot. But where was the blow struck? Where? Alas for theory! In the wilds of despotic Russia. It was followed up on the plains of Leipsic—by Russian, Prussian, and Austrian arms.

But let me not be mistaken. Do I, therefore, mean to contend—do I, therefore, give to our antagonists in the argument the advantage of ascribing to us the base tenet that an absolute monarchy is better than a free government? God forbid! What I mean is this, that, in appreciating the comparative excellence of political institutions, in estimating the force of national spirit, and the impulses of national feeling, it is idle—it is mere pedantry, to overlook the affections of nature. The order of nature could not subsist among mankind, if there were not an *instinctive* patriotism, I do not say unconnected with, but prior and paramount to, the desire of political amelioration. It may be very wrong that it should be so. I cannot help it. Our business is with fact. And surely it is not to be regretted that tyrants and conquerors should have learned, from the lessons of experience, that the first consideration suggested to the inhabitant of any country by a foreign invasion, is not whether the political constitution of the state be faultlessly perfect or not, but whether the altar at which he has worshipped—whether the home in which he has dwelt from his infancy—whether his wife and his children—whether the tombs of his forefathers—whether the place of the sovereign under whom he was born, and to whom he therefore owes (or, if it must be so stated, fancies that he therefore owes) allegiance—shall be abandoned to violence and profanation.

That, in the infancy of the French Revolution, many nations in Europe were, unfortunately, led to believe and to act upon a different persuasion,

is undoubtedly true; that whole countries were overrun by reforming conquerors, and flattered themselves with being proselytes till they found themselves victims. Even in this country, as I have already said, there have been times when we have been called upon to consider whether there was not something at home which must be mended before we could hope to repel a foreign invader with success.

It is fortunate for the world that this question should have been tried, if I may so say, to a disadvantage; that it should have been tried in countries where no man in his senses will say that the frame of political society is such as, according to the most moderate principles of regulated freedom, it ought to be; where, I will venture to say, without hazarding the imputation of being myself a visionary reformer, political society is not such as, after the successes of this war, and from the happy contagion of the example of Great Britain, it is sure gradually to become. It is fortunate for the world that this question should have been tried on its own merits; that, after twenty years of controversy, we should be authorised, by undoubted results, to revert to nature and to truth, and to disentangle the genuine feelings of the heart from the obstructions which a cold, presumptuous, generalising philosophy had wound around them.

One of the most delightful poets of this country, in describing the various proportions of natural blessings and advantages dispensed by Providence to the various nations of Europe, turns from the luxuriant plains and cloudless skies of Italy to the rugged mountains of Switzerland, and inquires whether there, also, in those barren and stormy regions, the "patriot passion" is found equally imprinted on the heart? He decides the question truly in the affirmative; and he says of the inhabitant of those bleak wilds:

> "Dear is that shed to which his soul conforms,
> And dear that hill which lifts him to the storms;
> And, as a child, when scaring sounds molest,
> Clings close and closer to the mother's breast,
> So the loud torrent and the whirlwind's roar,
> But bind him to his native mountains more." *

What Goldsmith thus beautifully applied to the physical varieties of soil and climate has been found no less true with respect to political institutions. A sober desire of improvement, a rational endeavour to redress error, and to correct imperfection in the political frame of human society, are not only natural, but laudable in man. But it is well that it should have been shown, by irrefragable proof, that these sentiments, even where most strongly and most justly felt, supersede not that devotion to native soil which is the foundation of national independence. And it is right that it should be understood and remembered, that the spirit of national independence alone, aroused where it had slumbered, enlightened where it had been deluded, and kindled into enthusiasm by the insults and outrages of an all-grasping invader, has been found sufficient, without internal changes and compromises of sovereigns or governments with their people—without relaxation of allegiance and abjurations of authority, to animate, as with one pervading soul, the different nations of the Continent; to combine, as into one congenial mass, their various feelings, passions, prejudices; to direct these concentrated energies with one impulse against the common tyrant; and to shake (and, may we not hope? to overthrow) the *Babel* of his iniquitous power.

Gentlemen, there is another argument, more peculiarly relating to our own country, which has at times been interposed to discourage the prosecution of the war. That this country is sufficient to its own defence, sufficient to its own happiness, sufficient to its own independence; and that the complicated combinations of continental policy are always hazardous to our interests, as well as burdensome to our means, has been, at several periods of the war, a favourite doctrine, not only with those who, for other reasons, wished to embarrass the measures of the Government, but with men of the most enlightened minds, of the most benevolent views, and the most ardent zeal for the interests as well as the honour of their country. May we not flatter ourselves, that upon this point, also, experience has decided in favour of the course of policy which has been actually pursued?

Can any man now look back upon the trial which we have gone through, and maintain that, at any period during the last twenty years, the plan of insulated policy could have been adopted, without having in the event, at this day, prostrated England at the foot of a conqueror? Great, indeed, has been the call upon our exertions; great, indeed, has been the drain upon our resources; long and wearisome has the struggle been; and late is the moment at which peace is brought within our reach. But even though the difficulties of the contest may have been enhanced, and its duration protracted by it, yet is there any man who seriously doubts whether the having associated our destinies with the destinies of other nations be or be not that which, under the blessing of Providence, has eventually secured the safety of all?

It is at the moment when such a trial has come to its issue, that it is fair to ask of those who have suffered under the pressure of protracted exertion (and of whom rather than of those who are assembled around me—for by whom have such privations been felt more sensibly?)—it is now, I say, the time to ask whether, at any former period of the contest, such a peace could have been made as would at once have guarded the national interests and corresponded with the

* Goldsmith's "Traveller."

national character? I address myself now to such persons only as think the character of a nation an essential part of its strength, and consequently of its safety. But if, among persons of that description, there be one who, with all his zeal for the glory of his country, has yet at times been willing to abandon the contest in mere weariness and despair, of such a man I would ask, whether he can indicate the period at which he now wishes that such an abandonment had been consented to by the Government and the Parliament of Great Britain?

Is it when the Continent was at peace—when, looking upon the map of Europe, you saw one mighty and connected system, one great luminary, with his attendant satellites circulating around him; at that period could this country have made peace, and have remained at peace for a twelvemonth? What is the answer? Why, that the experiment was tried. The result was the renewal of the war.

Was it at a later period, when the Continental system had been established? When two-thirds of the ports of Europe were shut against you? When but a single link was wanting to bind the Continent in a circling chain of iron, which should exclude you from intercourse with other nations? At that moment peace was most earnestly recommended to you. At that moment, gentlemen, I first came among you. At that moment I ventured to recommend to you perseverance, patient perseverance; and to express a hope that, by the mere strain of an unnatural effort, the massive bonds imposed upon the nations of the Continent might, at no distant period, burst asunder. I was heard by you with indulgence—I know not whether with conviction. But is it now to be regretted that we did not at that moment yield to the pressure of our wants or of our fears? What has been the issue? The Continental system was completed, with the sole exception of Russia, in the year 1812. In that year the pressure upon this country was undoubtedly painful. Had we yielded, the system would have been immortal. We persevered, and, before the conclusion of another year, the system was at an end: at an end, as all schemes of violence naturally terminate, not by a mild and gradual decay, such as waits upon a regular and well-spent life, but by sudden dissolution; at an end, like the breaking up of a winter's frost. But yesterday the whole Continent, like a mighty plain covered with one mass of ice, presented to the view a drear expanse of barren uniformity; to-day, the breath of heaven unbinds the earth, the streams begin to flow again, and the intercourse of human kind revives.

Can we regret that we did not, like the fainting traveller, lie down to rest—but, indeed, to perish—under the severity of that inclement season? Did we not more wisely to bear up, and to wait the change?

Gentlemen, I have said that I should be ashamed, and in truth I should be so, to address you in the language of exultation, if it were merely for the indulgence, however legitimate, of an exuberant and ungovernable joy. But they who have suffered great privations have a claim not merely to consolation, but to something more. They are justly to be compensated for what they have undergone, or lost, or hazarded, by the contemplation of what they have gained.

We have gained, then, a rank and authority in Europe, such as, for the life of the longest liver of those who now hear me, must place this country upon an eminence which no probable reverses can shake. We have gained, or rather we have recovered, a splendour of military glory, which places us by the side of the greatest military nations in the world. At the beginning of this war, while there was not a British bosom that did not beat with rapture at the exploits of our navy, there were few who would not have been contented to compromise for that reputation alone; to claim the sea as exclusively our province, and to leave to France and the other Continental powers the struggle for superiority by land. That fabled deity, whom I see portrayed upon the wall,* was considered as the exclusive patron of British prowess in battle; but in seeming accordance with the beautiful fiction of ancient mythology, our Neptune, in the heat of contest, smote the earth with his trident, and up sprang the fiery war-horse, the emblem of military power.

Let Portugal, now led to the pursuit of her flying conquerors — let liberated Spain — let France, invaded in her turn by those whom she had overrun or menaced with invasion, attest the triumphs of the army of Great Britain, and the equality of her military with her naval fame. And let those who, even after the triumphs of the Peninsula had begun, while they admitted that we had, indeed, wounded the giant in the heel, still deemed the rest of his huge frame invulnerable—let them now behold him reeling under the blows of united nations, and acknowledge at once the might of British arms and the force of British example.

I do not say that these are considerations with a view to which the war, if otherwise terminable, ought to have been purposely protracted; but I say that, upon the retrospect, we have good reason to rejoice that the war was not closed ingloriously and insecurely, when the latter events of it have been such as have established our security by our glory.

I say we have reason to rejoice, that, during the period when the Continent was prostrate before France — that, especially during the period when the Continental system was in force, we did not shrink from the struggle; that we did not make peace for present and momentary ease,

* A figure of Neptune.

unmindful of the permanent safety and greatness of this country; that we did not leave unsolved the momentous questions, whether this country could maintain itself against France, unaided and alone; or with the Continent divided; or with the Continent combined against it; whether, when the wrath of the tyrant of the European world was kindled against us with sevenfold fury, we could or could not walk unharmed and unfettered through the flames?

I say we have reason to rejoice that, throughout this more than *Punic* war, in which it has so often been the pride of our enemy to represent herself as the Rome, and England as the Carthage, of modern times (with at least this colour for the comparison, that the utter destruction of the modern Carthage has uniformly been proclaimed to be indispensable to the greatness of her rival), we have, I say, reason to rejoice that, unlike our assigned prototype, we have not been diverted by internal dissensions from the vigorous support of a vital struggle; that we have not suffered distress nor clamour to distract our counsels, or to check the exertions of our arms.

Gentlemen, for twenty years that I have sat in Parliament, I have been an advocate of the war. You knew this when you did me the honour to choose me as your representative. I then told you that I was the advocate of the war, because I was a lover of peace; but of a peace that should be the fruit of honourable exertion—a peace that should have a character of dignity—a peace that should be worth preserving, and should be likely to endure. I confess I was not sanguine enough, at that time, to hope that I should so soon have an opportunity of justifying my professions. But I know not why six weeks hence, such a peace should not be made as England may not only be glad, but proud to ratify. Not such a peace, gentlemen, as that of Amiens—a short and feverish interval of unrefreshing repose. During that peace, which of you went or sent a son to Paris, who did not feel or learn that an Englishman appeared in France shorn of the dignity of his country; with the mien of a suppliant, and the conscious prostration of a man who had consented to purchase his gain or his ease by submission? But let a peace be made to-morrow, such as the allies have now the power to dictate, and the meanest of the subjects of this kingdom shall not walk the streets of Paris without being pointed out as the compatriot of Wellington; as one of that nation whose firmness and perseverance have humbled France and rescued Europe.

Is there any man that has a heart in his bosom who does not find, in the contemplation of this contrast alone, a recompense for the struggles and the sufferings of years?

But, gentlemen, the doing right is not only the most honourable course of action, it is also the most profitable in its result. At any former period of the war, the independence of almost all the other countries, our allies, would have been to be purchased with sacrifices profusely poured out from the lap of British victory. Not a throne to be re-established, not a province to be evacuated, not a garrison to be withdrawn, but this country would have had to make compensation out of her conquests for the concessions obtained from the enemy. Now, happily, this work is already done, either by our efforts or to our hands. The Peninsula free—the lawful commonwealth of European states already, in a great measure, restored, Great Britain may now appear in the congress of the world, rich in conquests, nobly and rightfully won, with little claim upon her faith or her justice, whatever may be the spontaneous impulse of her generosity or her moderation.

Such, gentlemen, is the situation and prospect of affairs at the moment at which I have the honour to address you. That you, gentlemen, may have your full share in the prosperity of your country, is my sincere and earnest wish. The courage with which you bore up in adverse circumstances eminently entitles you to this reward.

For myself, gentlemen, while I rejoice in your returning prosperity, I rejoice also that our connection began under auspices so much less favourable; that we had an opportunity of knowing each other's minds in times when the minds of men are brought to the proof—times of trial and difficulty. I had the satisfaction of avowing to you, and you the candour and magnanimity to approve, the principles and opinions by which my public conduct has uniformly been guided, at a period when the soundness of those opinions and the application of those principles was matter of doubt and controversy. I thought, and I said, at the time of our first meeting, that the cause of England and of civilised Europe must be ultimately triumphant, if we but preserved our spirit untainted and our constancy unshaken. Such an assertion was, at that time, the object of ridicule with many persons: a single year has elapsed, and it is now the voice of the whole world.

Gentlemen, we may, therefore, confidently indulge the hope that our opinions will continue in unison; that our concurrence will be as cordial as it has hitherto been, if unhappily any new occasion of difficulty or embarrassment should hereafter arise.

At the present moment, I am sure, we are equally desirous to bury the recollection of all our differences with others in that general feeling of exultation in which all opinions happily combine.

ON PARLIAMENTARY REFORM, 1820.*

I need not say, gentlemen, that I am one of the last men to disparage the utility and dignity

* Delivered at Liverpool, March 18, 1820.

of popular elections. I have good cause to speak of them in far different language. But, among numberless other considerations which endear to me the favours which I have received at your hands, I confess it is one that, as your representative, I am enabled to speak my genuine sentiments on this (as I think it) vital question of parliamentary reform, without the imputation of shrinking from popular canvass, or of seeking shelter for myself in that species of representation which, as an element in the composition of Parliament, I never shall cease to defend.

In truth, gentlemen, though the question of reform is made the pretext of those persons who have vexed the country for some months, I verily believe that there are very few, even of them, who either give credit to their own exaggerations, or care much about the improvements which they recommend. Why, do we not see that the most violent of the reformers of the day are aiming at seats in that assembly, which, according to their own theories, they should have left to wallow in its own pollution, discountenanced and unredeemed? It is true that if they found their way there, they might endeavour to bring us to a sense of our misdeeds, and to urge us to redeem our characters by some self-condemning ordinance; but would not the authority of their names, as our associates, have more than counterbalanced the force of their eloquence as our reformers.

But, gentlemen, I am for the whole constitution. The liberty of the subject as much depends on the maintenance of the constitutional prerogative of the Crown—on the acknowledgment of the legitimate power of the other House of Parliament—as it does in upholding that supreme power (for such is the power of the purse in one sense of the word, though not in the sense of the resolution of 1648) which resides in the democratical branch of the constitution. Whatever beyond its just proportion was gained by one part, would be gained at the expense of the whole; and the balance is now, perhaps, as nearly poised as human wisdom can adjust it. I fear to touch that balance, the disturbance of which must bring confusion on the nation.

Gentlemen, I trust there are few, very few, reasonable and enlightened men ready to lend themselves to projects of confusion. But I confess I very much wish that all who are not ready to do so would consider the ill effect of any countenance given publicly or by apparent implication, to those whom in their hearts and judgments they despise. I remember that most excellent and able man, Mr Wilberforce, once saying in the House of Commons that he "never believed an Opposition really to wish mischief to the country, that they only wished just so much mischief as might drive their opponents out, and place themselves in their room." No- gentlemen, I cannot help thinki- are some persons tampering with the question of reform something in the same spirit. They do not go so far as the reformers; they even state irreconcilable differences of opinion; but to a certain extent they agree, and even co-operate with them. They co-operate with them in inflaming the public feeling, not only against the Government, but against the support given by Parliament to that Government, in the hope, no doubt, of attracting to themselves the popularity which is lost to their opponents, and thus being enabled to correct and retrieve the errors of a displaced administration. Vain and hopeless task to raise such a spirit and then to govern it! They may stimulate the steeds into fury, till the chariot is hurried to the brink of a precipice; but do they flatter themselves that they can then leap in, and, hurling the incompetent driver from his seat, check the reins just in time to turn from the precipice and avoid the fall? I fear they would attempt it in vain. The impulse once given may be too impetuous to be controlled; and intending only to change the guidance of the machine, they may hurry it and themselves to irretrievable destruction.

May every man who has a stake in the country, whether from situation, from character, from wealth, from his family, or from the hopes of his children—may every man who has a sense of the blessings for which he is indebted to the form of government under which he lives, see that the time is come at which his decision must be taken, and when once taken, steadfastly acted upon—for or against the institutions of the British monarchy. The time is come at which there is but that line of demarcation. On which side of that line we, gentlemen, shall range ourselves, our choice has long ago been made. In acting upon that, our common choice, with my best efforts and exertions, I shall at once faithfully represent your sentiments and satisfy my own judgment and conscience.

RIGHT POLICY OF BRITAIN.*

The end which I have always had in view, as the legitimate object of pursuit to a British statesman, I can describe in one word. The language of the philosopher is diffusely benevolent. It professes the amelioration of the lot of all mankind. I hope that my heart beats as high towards other nations of the earth as that of any one who vaunts his philanthropy; but I am contented to confess that the main object of my contemplation is the interest of England. Not that the interest of England can stand isolated and alone. The situation that she holds forbids an exclusive selfishness; her prosperity must contribute to the prosperity of other nations, her stability to the safety of the world. But it does not follow that we are called upon to mix our- every occasion with a meddling activity

* Delivered at Plymouth in 1823.

in the concerns of the nations around us. There are men, actuated by noble principles and generous feelings, who would rush forward at once from the sense of indignation at aggression, and deem that no act of injustice should be perpetrated from one end of the universe to the other, but the sword of Great Britain ought to leap from its scabbard to avenge it. But as it is the province of law to control the excess even of laudable feelings in individuals, so it is the duty of Government to restrain, within due bounds, the ebullition of national impulses which it cannot blame.

But while we thus control our feelings by our duty, let it not be said that we cultivate peace because we fear, or because we are unprepared for war; on the contrary, if eight months ago the Government proclaimed this country to be prepared for war, every month of peace that has since passed has but made us so much the more capable of exertion. The resources created by peace are the means of war. In cherishing these resources we accumulate our means. Our present repose is no more a proof of inability than the state of inactivity in which I see those mighty ships float in these waters is a proof that they are devoid of strength and incapable of being fitted out for action. You well know how soon one of those stupendous masses, now reposing on their shadows in perfect stillness—how soon, upon any call of patriotism, it would assume the likeness of an animated thing, instinct with life and motion—how soon it would ruffle up its swelling plumage—how quickly it would put forth all its beauty and its bravery, collect its scattered elements of strength, and awake its dormant thunder. Such as is one of those magnificent machines springing from inaction into a display of its might—such is England herself—while, apparently passive, she silently concentrates the power to be put forth on an adequate occasion. But God forbid that that occasion should arise! After a war of a quarter of a century, sometimes single-handed, England now needs a period of tranquillity. Long may we be enabled to improve the blessings of our present situation, to cultivate the arts of peace, to give to commerce greater extension, and new spheres of employment, and to confirm the prosperity now diffused throughout this island

---

SYDNEY SMITH.

1771-1845.

THE HOUSE OF LORDS AND THE REFORM BILL.*

Mr Bailiff,—I have spoken so often on this subject, that I am sure both you and the gentlemen here present will be obliged to me for saying but little, and that favour I am as willing to confer as you can be to receive it. I feel most deeply the event which has taken place, because, by putting the two Houses of Parliament in collision with each other, it will impede the public business, and diminish the public prosperity. I feel it as a churchman, because I cannot but blush to see so many dignitaries of the Church arrayed against the wishes and happiness of the people. I feel it more than all, because I believe it will sow the seeds of deadly hatred between the aristocracy and the great mass of the people. The loss of the bill I do not feel, and for the best of all possible reasons—because I have not the slightest idea that it *is* lost. I have no more doubt, before the expiration of the winter, that this bill will pass, than I have that the annual tax bills will pass, and greater certainty than this no man can have, for Franklin tells us there are but two things certain in this world—death and taxes. As for the possibility of the House of Lords preventing ere long a reform of Parliament, I hold it to be the most absurd notion that ever entered into human imagination. I do not mean to be disrespectful, but the attempt of the Lords to stop the progress of reform reminds me very forcibly of the great storm of Sidmouth, and of the conduct of the excellent Mrs Partington on that occasion. In the winter of 1824 there set in a great flood upon that town—the tide rose to an incredible height—the waves rushed in upon the houses, and everything was threatened with destruction! In the midst of this sublime and terrible storm, Dame Partington, who lived upon the beach, was seen at the door of her house, with mop and pattens, trundling her mop, squeezing out the sea-water, and vigorously pushing away the Atlantic Ocean. The Atlantic was roused. Mrs Partington's spirit was up; but I need not tell you that the contest was unequal. The Atlantic Ocean beat Mrs Partington. She was excellent at a slop, or a puddle, but she should not have meddled

* Delivered at Taunton during the agitation which succeeded the rejection of the Reform Bill by the House of Lords in 1831.

with a tempest. Gentlemen, be at your ease—be quiet and steady. You will beat Mrs Partington.

They tell you, gentlemen, in the debates by which we have been recently occupied, that the bill is not justified by experience. I do not think this true; but, if it were true, nations are sometimes compelled to act without experience for their guide, and to trust to their own sagacity for the anticipation of consequences. The instances where this country has been compelled thus to act have been so eminently successful that I see no cause for fear, even if we were acting in the manner imputed to us by our enemies. What precedents and what experience were there at the Reformation, when the country, with one unanimous effort, pushed out the pope and his grasping and ambitious clergy? What experience, when, at the Revolution, we drove away our ancient race of kings, and chose another family, more congenial to our free principles? And yet to those two events, contrary to experience, and unguided by precedents, we owe all our domestic happiness and civil and religious freedom—and having got rid of corrupt priests and despotic kings by our sense and our courage, are we now to be intimidated by the awful danger of extinguishing boroughmongers, and shaking from our necks the ignominious yoke which their baseness has imposed upon it? Go on, they say, as you have done for these three hundred years last past. I answer, it is impossible; five hundred people now write and read where one hundred wrote and read fifty years ago? The iniquities and enormities of the borough system are now known to the meanest of the people. You have a different sort of men to deal with—you must change, because the beings whom you govern are changed. After all, and to be short, I must say that it has always appeared to me to be the most absolute nonsense that we cannot be a great, or a rich and happy nation, without suffering ourselves to be bought and sold every five years like a pack of negro slaves. I hope I am not a very rash man, but I would launch boldly into this experiment without any fear of consequences, and I believe there is not a man here present who would not cheerfully embark with me. As to the enemies of the bill who pretend to be reformers, I know them, I believe, better than you do, and I earnestly caution you against them. You will have no more of reform than they are compelled to grant—you will have no reform at all, if they can avoid it—you will be hurried into a war to turn your attention from reform. They do not understand you—they will not believe in the improvement you have made—they think the English of the present day are as the English of the times of Queen Anne or George I. They know no more of the present state of their own country than of the state of the Esquimaux Indians. Gentlemen, I view their ignorance of the present state of the country with the most serious concern, and I believe they will one day or another waken into conviction with horror and dismay. I will omit no means of rousing them to a sense of their danger. For this object I cheerfully sign the petition proposed by Dr Kinglake.

LORD LYNDHURST.

1772-1863.

REVIEW OF THE SESSION OF 1836.*

My Lords,—I am anxious to call your attention to the motion of which I gave notice on a former night. It is with extreme reluctance and with real diffidence that I rise to address you on this occasion; but I am compelled to pursue this course; I am driven to it in consequence of the attack made upon me and my noble friends around me, but more pointedly upon myself, by the noble baron opposite on a former night. My Lords, the noble baron has accused us of having misconducted ourselves in the discharge of our duty in this House. He has charged me, in particular, with having "mutilated" bills laid on your Lordships' table by his Majesty's Government, or which have come up from the other House of Parliament. He has stated in distinct terms, that the course which I have individually pursued has been calculated to alienate from your Lordships' House the regard and the respect of the country. The terms that the noble baron used were, I believe, even stronger than those which I have mentioned. The noble baron said our conduct was calculated to excite "disgust" in the country. Now, my Lords, if these charges had been confined to this House, I should have reposed under them in silence, because all that has passed has passed in your presence, and I should not have feared, under such circumstances, your judgment with respect to my conduct. But it was obvious that

* Delivered in the House of Lords, 18th August 1836.

these charges were intended to take a wider range, and to embrace a much more extensive sphere, and it is therefore that I have felt myself called upon to rise for the purpose of entering into a vindication of my conduct, and, however unequal the contest may be between the noble baron and myself, to justify to your Lordships and the country the part which I have taken in these proceedings.

My Lords, it does appear to me that those who sit on this side of the House have been most moderate and forbearing towards his Majesty's Government. We have made no motion for papers, none for inquiry. We have passed no resolutions of distrust or censure. We have not used the ordinary weapons of those usually engaged in opposition in this or the other House of Parliament, and which must be so familiar to the noble lords opposite. Our conduct throughout the session has been entirely defensive. When a bill has been laid on the table by any of his Majesty's Government, or when it has come up from the other House of Parliament, we have examined it with care, with attention, and industry. If we have found it vicious in principle we have proposed its rejection; while, if it has occurred to us, on a careful investigation, that it might be so modelled as to answer the purpose for which it was intended, we have carefully directed our efforts to the accomplishment of that object. I am justified, then, in saying, that during the whole of this session, adverting to the course we have pursued, our conduct has been purely defensive, and that we have exercised towards his Majesty's Government as much moderation and forbearance as was consistent with a due discharge of the duty which we owe to the country.

My Lords, it is impossible to enter into a consideration, however general, of the subjects to which I am about to direct your attention without referring to his Majesty's speech at the commencement of the present session, and without contrasting the brilliant anticipations contained in that speech, with the sad reality that has since occurred; a result as disproportionate in execution to the expectations that were held out, as the lofty position of the noble viscount at that period, to what he will allow me to style his humble condition at the present moment. Gazing on these two pictures, one is tempted to apply to the noble lord that which was said of a predecessor of his in the high office of first minister of the Crown, and who, in the careless confidence of his character, bore some resemblance to the noble viscount:

> "His promises were, as he then was, mighty,
> His performance, as he now is—nothing."

[The speaker then went over seriatim the various measures recommended in the king's speech, and showed that notwithstanding his desire to support them as far as he could conscientiously, they had either entirely miscarried in Parliament, or had been partially adopted in an altered form. He concluded as follows:]

In former times, my Lords, amid such defeats, and unable to carry those measures which he considered essential, a minister would have thought he had only one course to pursue. But these are antiquated notions—everything has changed. This fastidious delicacy forms no part of the character of the noble viscount. He has told us, and his acts correspond with his assertions, that notwithstanding the insubordination that prevails around him, in spite of the mutinous and sullen temper of his crew, he will stick to the vessel while a single plank remains afloat. Let me, however, as a friendly adviser of the noble viscount, recommend him to get her as speedily as possible into still water.

> "Fortier occupa
> Portum."

Let the noble lord look to the empty benches around him—

> ". . . . . nonne vides, ut
> Nudum remigio latus,
> . . . . . ac sine funibus
> Vix durare carinæ
> Possint imperiosius
> Acquor?"

After all, there is something in the efforts and exertions of the noble viscount not altogether unamusing or uninstructive. It is impossible, too, under any circumstances, not to respect

> "The brave man struggling in the storms of fate."

May a part at least of what follows be averted:

> "And greatly falling with a falling state."

My consolation is, that whatever be the disposition of the noble viscount, he has not sufficient strength, though his locks, I believe, are yet unshorn, to pull down the pillars of the building, and involve the whole in his ruin. I trust it will long survive his fall.

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

1775-1847.

COLONIAL SLAVERY, 1831.

No man can more sincerely abhor, detest, and abjure slavery than I do. I hold it in utter detestation, however men may attempt to palliate or excuse it by differences of colour, creed, or clime. In all its gradations, and in every form, I am its mortal foe. The speech of an opponent on this question has filled me with indignation. "What," said this party, "would you come in between a man and his freehold!" I started as if something unholy had trampled on my father's grave, and I exclaimed with horror, "A freehold in a human being!" I know nothing of this individual; I give him credit for being a gentleman of humanity; but, if he be so, it only makes the case the stronger; for the circumstance of such a man upholding such a system shows the horrors of that system in itself and its effect in deceiving the minds of those who are connected with it, wherever it exists. We are told that the slave is *not fit* to receive his freedom—that he could not endure freedom without revolting. Why, does he not endure slavery without revolting? With all that he has to bear, he does not revolt now; and will he be more ready to revolt when you take away the lash? Foolish argument!

But I will take them upon their own ground—the ground of *gradual* amelioration and preparation. Well; are not eight years of education sufficient to prepare a man for anything? Seven years are accounted quite sufficient for an apprenticeship to any profession, or for any art or science; and are not eight years enough for the negro? If eight years have passed away without preparation, so would eighty, if we were to allow them so many. There is a time for everything—but it would seem there is no time for the emancipation of the slave. Mr Buxton most ably and unanswerably stated to the House of Commons the awful decrease in population; that, in fourteen colonies, in the course of ten years, there had been a decrease in the population of 145,801—that is, in other words, 145,801 human beings had been murdered by this system—their bodies gone to the grave—their spirits before their God. In the eight years that they have had to educate their slaves for liberty, but which have been useless to them—in those eight years, one-twelfth have gone into the grave murdered! Every day, ten victims are thus despatched! While we are speaking, they are sinking; while we are debating, they are dying! As human, as accountable beings, why should we suffer this any longer? Let every man take his own share in this business. I am resolved, if sent back to Parliament, that I will bear my part. I purpose fully to divide the House on the motion, that every negro child born after the first of January 1832 shall be free. They say, "Oh, do not emancipate the slaves suddenly; they are not prepared, they will revolt!" Are they afraid of the insurrection of the infants? Or, do you think that the mother will rise up in rebellion as she hugs her little freeman to her breast, and thinks that he will one day become her protector? Or, will she teach him to be her avenger? Oh, no! there can be no such pretence. . . .

I will carry with me to my own country the recollection of this splendid scene. Where is the man that can resist the argument of this day? I go to my native land under its influence; and let me remind you that land has its glory, that no slave ship was ever launched from any of its numerous ports. I will gladly join any party to do good to the poor negro slaves. Let each extend to them the arm of his compassion; let each aim to deliver his fellow-man from distress. I shall go and tell my countrymen that they must be first in this race of humanity.

THE IRISH DISTURBANCES BILL, 1833.*

I do not rise to fawn or cringe to this House; I do not rise to supplicate you to be merciful towards the nation to which I belong—towards a nation which, though subject to England, yet is distinct from it. It is a distinct nation; it has been treated as such by this country, as may be proved by history, and by seven hundred years of tyranny. I call upon this House, as you value the liberty of England, not to allow the present nefarious bill to pass. In it are involved the liberties of England, the liberty of the press, and of every other institution dear to Englishmen.

Against the bill I protest in the name of the Irish people, and in the face of heaven. I treat with scorn the puny and pitiful assertions that grievances are not to be complained of, that our redress is not to be agitated; for, in such cases, remonstrances cannot be too strong, agitation cannot be too violent, to show to the world with what injustice our fair claims are met, and under what tyranny the people suffer.

There are two frightful clauses in this bill. The one which does away with trial by jury, and which I have called upon you to baptize;

* Delivered in the House of Commons in 1822.

you call it a *court-martial*—a mere nickname; I stigmatise it as a *revolutionary tribunal.* What, in the name of heaven, is it, if it is not a revolutionary tribunal? It annihilates the trial by jury: it drives the judge off his bench—the man who, from experience, could weigh the nice and delicate points of a case—who could discriminate between the straightforward testimony and the suborned evidence—who could see, plainly and readily, the justice or injustice of the accusation. It turns out this man who is free, unshackled, unprejudiced—who has no previous opinions to control the clear exercise of his duty. You do away with that which is more sacred than the throne itself; that for which your king reigns, your Lords deliberate, your Commons assemble.

If ever I doubted before of the success of our agitation for repeal, this bill, this infamous bill, the way in which it has been received by the House, the manner in which its opponents have been treated, the personalities to which they have been subjected, the yells with which one of them has this night been greeted—all these things dissipate my doubts, and tell me of its complete and early triumph. Do you think those yells will be forgotten? Do you suppose their echo will not reach the plains of my injured and insulted country; that they will not be whispered in her green valleys, and heard from her lofty hills? Oh! they will be heard there; yes, and they will not be forgotten. The youth of Ireland will bound with indignation; they will say, "We are eight millions, and you treat us thus, as though we were no more to your country than the Isle of Guernsey or Jersey!"

I have done my duty; I stand acquitted to my conscience and my country: I have opposed this measure throughout; and I now protest against it as harsh, oppressive, uncalled for, unjust, as establishing an infamous precedent by retaliating crime against crime—as tyrannous, cruelly and vindictively tyrannous.

LORD BROUGHAM.*

1779-1868.

INAUGURAL DISCOURSE.†

It now becomes me to return my very sincere and respectful thanks for the kindness which has placed me in a chair, filled of former times by so many great men, whose names might well make any comparison formidable to a far more worthy successor.

While I desire you to accept this unexaggerated expression of gratitude, I am anxious to address you rather in the form which I now adopt, than in the more usual one of an unpremeditated discourse. I shall thus, at least, prove that the remarks which I deem it my duty to make are the fruit of mature reflection, and that I am unwilling to discharge an important office in a perfunctory manner.

I feel very sensibly that if I shall now urge you by general exhortations to be instant in the pursuit of the learning which, in all its branches, flourishes under the kindly shelter of these roofs, I may weary you with the unprofitable repetition of a thrice-told tale; and if I presume to offer my advice touching the conduct of your studies, I may seem to trespass upon the province of those venerable persons under whose care you have the singular happiness to be placed. But I would nevertheless expose myself to either charge, for the sake of joining my voice with theirs in anxiously entreating you to believe how incomparably the present season is verily and indeed the most precious of your whole lives. It is not the less true, because it has been oftentimes said, that the period of youth is by far the best fitted for the improvement of the mind, and the retirement of a college almost exclusively adapted to much study. At your enviable age everything has the lively interest of novelty and freshness; attention is perpetually sharpened by curiosity; and the memory is tenacious of the deep impressions it thus receives, to a degree unknown in after-life; while the distracting cares of the world, or its beguiling pleasures, cross not the threshold of these calm retreats; its distant noise and bustle are faintly heard, making the shelter you enjoy more grateful; and the struggles of anxious mortals embarked upon that troublous sea are viewed from an eminence, the security of which is rendered more sweet by the prospect of the scene below. Yet a little

---

* "Mr Brougham speaks in a loud and unmitigated tone of voice, sometimes almost approaching to a scream. He is fluent, rapid, vehement, full of his subject, with evidently a great deal to say, and very regardless of the manner of saying it. . . . Such indeed is the activity of his mind that it appears to require neither repose nor any other stimulus than a delight in its own exercise. He can turn his hand to anything, but he cannot be idle."—*Hazlitt's Spirit of the Age.*

† When elected Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow; delivered April 6, 1825.

while, and you too will be plunged into those waters of bitterness; and will cast an eye of regret, as now I do, upon the peaceful regions you have quitted for ever. Such is your lot as members of society; but it will be your own fault if you look back on this place with repentance or with shame; and be well assured that, whatever time—ay, every hour—you squander here on unprofitable idling, will then rise up against you, and be paid for by years of bitter but unavailing regrets. Study, then, I beseech you, so to store your minds with the exquisite learning of former ages, that you may always possess within yourselves sources of rational and refined enjoyment, which will enable you to set at naught the grosser pleasures of sense, whereof other men are slaves; and so imbue yourselves with the sound philosophy of later days, forming yourselves to the virtuous habits which are its legitimate offspring, that you may walk unhurt through the trials which await you, and may look down upon the ignorance and error that surround you, not with lofty and supercilious contempt, as the sages of old times, but with the vehement desire of enlightening those who wander in darkness, and who are by so much the more endeared to us by how much they want our assistance.

Assuming the improvement of his own mind and of the lot of his fellow-creatures to be the great end of every man's existence, who is removed above the care of providing for his sustenance, and to be the indispensable duty of every man, as far as his own immediate wants leave him any portion of time unemployed, our attention is naturally directed to the means by which so great and urgent a work may best be performed; and as in the limited time allotted to this discourse I cannot hope to occupy more than a small portion of so wide a field, I shall confine myself to two subjects, or rather to a few observations upon two subjects, both of them appropriate to this place, but either of them affording ample materials for an entire course of lectures—the study of the rhetorical art, by which useful truths are promulgated with effect, and the purposes to which a proficiency in this art should be made subservient.

It is an extremely common error among young persons, impatient of academical discipline, to turn from the painful study of ancient, and particularly of Attic composition, and solace themselves with works rendered easy by the familiarity of their own tongue. They plausibly contend, that as powerful or captivating diction in a pure English style is, after all, the attainment they are in search of, the study of the best English models affords the shortest road to this point; and even admitting the ancient examples to have been the great fountains from which all eloquence is drawn, they would rather profit, as it were, by the classical labours of their English predecessors, than toil over the same path themselves. In a word, they would treat the perishable results of those labours as the standard, and give themselves no care about the immortal originals. This argument, the thin covering which indolence weaves for herself, would speedily sink all the fine arts into barrenness and insignificance. Why, according to such reasoners, should a sculptor or painter encounter the toil of a journey to Athens or to Rome? Far better work at home, and profit by the labour of those who have resorted to the Vatican and the Parthenon, and founded an English school adapted to the taste of our own country. Be you assured that the works of the English chisel fall not more short of the wonders of the Acropolis, than the best productions of modern pens fall short of the chaste, finished, nervous, and overwhelming compositions of them that "resistless fulmined over Greece." Be equally sure that, with hardly any exception, the great things of poetry and of eloquence have been done by men who cultivated the mighty exemplars of Athenian genius with daily and with nightly devotion. Among poets there is hardly an exception to this rule, unless may be so deemed Shakespeare, an exception to all rules, and Dante, familiar as a contemporary with the works of Roman art, composed in his mother tongue, having taken, not so much for his guide as for his "master," Virgil, himself almost a translator from the Greeks. But among orators I know of none among the Romans, and scarce any in our own times. Cicero honoured the Greek masters with such singular observance, that he not only repaired to Athens for the sake of finishing his rhetorical education, but afterward continued to practise the art of declaiming in Greek; and although he afterward fell into a less pure manner through the corrupt blandishments of the Asian taste, yet do we find him ever prone to extol the noble perfections of his first masters as something placed beyond the reach of all imitation. Nay, at a mature period of his life, he occupied himself in translating the greater orations of the Greeks which composed almost exclusively his treatise "De optimo genere Oratoris;" as if to write a discourse on oratorial perfection were merely to present the reader with the two immortal speeches upon the Crown. Sometimes we find him imitating, even to a literal version, the beauties of those divine originals—as the beautiful passage of Æschines, in the "Timarchus," upon the torments of the guilty, which the Roman orator has twice made use of, almost word for word; once in the oration for Sextus Roscius, the earliest he delivered, and again in a more mature effort of his genius, the oration against L. Piso.*

* "Let no one think that crimes arise from the instigation of the gods, and not from the rash intemperance of men; or that the profane are driven and chastised, as we see them on the stage, by furies with blazing torches. The eager lusts of the flesh, and the

I have dwelt the rather upon the authority of M. Tullius, because it enables us at once to answer the question, Whether a study of the Roman orators be not sufficient for refining the taste? If the Greeks were the models of an excellence which the first of Roman orators never attained, although ever aspiring after it—nay, if so far from being satisfied with his own success, he even in those his masters found something which his ears desiderated ("ita sunt avidæ et capaces; et semper aliquid immensum infinitumque desiderant" [so eager are they and capacious, so continually desirous of something boundless and infinite]), he either fell short while copying them, or he failed by diverting his worship to the false gods of the Asian school. In the one case, were we to rest satisfied with studying the Roman, we should only be imitating the imperfect copy, instead of the pure original — like him who should endeavour to catch a glimpse of some beauty by her reflection in a glass, that weakened her tints, if it did not distort her features. In the other case, we should not be imitating the same, but some less perfect original, and looking at the wrong beauty; not her whose chaste and simple attractions commanded the adoration of all Greece, but some garish damsel from Rhodes or Chios, just brilliant and languishing enough to captivate the less pure taste of half-civilised Rome.

But there are other reasons too weighty to be passed over, which justify the same decided preference. Not to mention the incomparable beauty and power of the Greek language, the study of which alone affords the means of enriching our own, the compositions of Cicero, exquisite as they are for beauty of diction, often remarkable for ingenious argument and brilliant wit, not seldom excelling in deep pathos, are nevertheless so extremely rhetorical, fashioned by an art so little concealed, and sacrificing the subject to a display of the speaker's powers, admirable as those are, that nothing can be less adapted to the genius of modern elocution, which requires a constant and almost exclusive attention to the business in hand. In all his orations which were spoken (for, singular as it may seem, the remark applies less to those which were only written, as all the "Verrine," except the first, all the "Philippics," except the first and ninth, and the "Pro Milone") hardly two pages can be found which a modern assembly would bear. Some admirable arguments on evidence and the credit of witnesses, might be urged to a jury;* several passages, given by him on the merits of the case, and in defence against the charge, might be spoken in mitigation of punishment after a conviction or confession of guilt; but, whether we regard the political or forensic orations, the style, both in respect of the reasoning and the ornaments, is wholly unfit for the more severe and less trifling nature of modern affairs in the senate or at the bar. Now it is altogether otherwise with the Greek masters. Changing a few phrases, which the difference of religion and of manners might render objectionable—moderating, in some degree, the virulence of invective, especially against private character, to suit the chivalrous courtesy of modern hostility—there is hardly one of the political or forensic orations of the Greeks that might not be delivered in similar circumstances before our senate or tribunals; while their funeral and other panegyrical discourses are much less inflated and unsubstantial than those of the most approved masters of the epideictic style, the French preachers and academicians. Whence this difference between the masterpieces of Greek and Roman eloquence? Whence but from the rigid steadiness with which the Greek orator keeps the object of all eloquence perpetually in view, never speaking for mere speaking's sake; while the Latin rhetorician, "*ingenii sui nimium amator*" [too fond of his own ingenuity], and, as though he deemed his occupation a trial of skill or display of accomplishments, seems ever and anon to lose sight of the subject-matter in the attempt to illustrate and adorn it; and pours forth passages sweet indeed, but unprofitable—fitted to tickle the ear, without reaching the heart. Where, in all the orations of Cicero, or of him who almost equals him, Livy, "*miræ facundiæ homo*" [admirable for his command of language],* shall we find anything like those thick successions of short questions in which Demosthenes oftentimes forges, as it were, with a few rapidly following strokes, the whole massive chain of his argument, as in the "Chersonese:" "Let this force be once destroyed or scattered, and what are we to do if Philip marches on the Cheronese? Put Diopeithes on his trial? But how will that better our condition? And how shall we send them succour if prevented by the winds? But, by Jupiter, he will *not march!* And who is our surety for that?"† or, comprising all of a long narrative that suits his argument in a single sentence, presenting a lengthened series of events

insatiable desire for more—these swell the ranks of the robber, and crowd the deck of the pirate—these are to every one his own fury!"

* "There is a singular example of this in the remarks on the evidence and cross-examination in the oration for L. Flaccus, pointed out to me by my friend Mr Scarlett (now Lord Abinger), the mention of whose name affords an illustration of my argument, for, as a more consummate master of the forensic art in all its branches never lived, so no man is more conversant with the works of his predecessors in ancient times. Lord Erskine, too, perhaps the first of judicial orators, ancient or modern, had well studied the noble remains of the classic age."—*Brougham.*

* Quintilian.

† Of many of the original Greek and Latin quotations given in the course of the speech, only the English equivalent has been retained.

at a single glance, as in the Παραπρεσδεία: "There were only five days in which this man (Æschines, who had been sent as an ambassador) brought back those lies — you believed — the Phocians listened — gave themselves up — *perished!*"

But though the more business-like manner of modern debate approaches much nearer the style of the Greek than the Latin compositions, it must be admitted that it falls short of the great originals in the closeness, and, as it were, density of the argument; in the habitual sacrifice of all ornament to use, or rather in the constant union of the two; so that, while a modern orator too frequently has his speech parcelled out into compartments, one devoted to argument, another to declamation, a third to mere ornament, as if he should say, "Now your reason shall be convinced; now I am going to rouse your passions; and now you shall see how I can amuse your fancy," the more vigorous ancient argued in declaiming, and made his very boldest figures subservient to, or rather an integral part of his reasoning. The most figurative and highly wrought passage in all antiquity is the famous oath in Demosthenes; yet, in the most pathetic part of it, and when he seems to have left the furthest behind him the immediate subject of his speech, led away by the prodigious interest of the recollections he has excited; when he is naming the very tombs where the heroes of Marathon lie buried, he instantly, not abruptly, but by a most felicitous and easy transition, returns into the midst of the main argument of his whole defence—that the merits of public servants, not the success of their councils, should be the measure of the public gratitude toward them—a position that runs through the whole speech, and to which he makes the funeral honours bestowed alike on all the heroes serve as a striking and appropriate support. With the same ease does Virgil manage his celebrated transition in the "Georgics;" where, in the midst of the Thracian war and while at an immeasurable distance from agricultural topics, the magician strikes the ground on the field of battle, where helmets are buried, and suddenly raises before us the lonely husbandman in a remote age, peacefully tilling its soil, and driving his plough among the rusty armour and mouldering remains of the warrior.*

* "Georgicon," i. 493:

"Scilicet et tempus veniet, cum finibus illis
Agricola, incurvo terram molitus aratro,
Exesa inveniet scabra rubigine pila:
Aut gravibus rastris galeas pulsabit inanes.
Grandiaque effossis mirabitur ossa sepulcris."

("The time shall come when in these borders round
The swain who turns the soil with crooked plough,
Shall javelins find, and spears eaten with rust,
Or with his harrows strike on empty helmets,
And see with wonder the gigantic bones
Of opened graves.")

But if a further reason is required for giving the preference to the Greek orators, we may find it in the greater diversity and importance of the subjects upon which their speeches were delivered. Besides the number of admirable orations and of written arguments upon causes merely forensic, we have every subject of public policy, all the great affairs of state, successively forming the topics of discussion. Compare them with Cicero in this particular, and the contrast is striking. His finest oration for matter and diction together is in defence of an individual charged with murder, and there is nothing in the case to give it a public interest, except that the parties were of opposite factions in the state, and the deceased a personal as well as political adversary of the speaker. His most exquisite performance in point of diction, perhaps the most perfect prose composition in the language, was addressed to one man, in palliation of another's having borne arms against him in a war with a personal rival. Even the Catilinarians, his most splendid declamations, are principally denunciations of a single conspirator; the "Philippics," his most brilliant invectives, abuse of a profligate leader; and the Verrine orations, charges against an individual governor. Many, indeed almost all the subjects of his speeches, rise to the rank of what the French term *Causes célèbres;* but they seldom rise higher.* Of Demosthenes, on the other hand,

* "The cause of this difference between the Greek and Roman orators has been so strikingly described by a learned friend of mine, in the following note upon the above passage, that the celebrity of his name, were I at liberty to mention it, is not required to attract the reader's notice. 'In Athens,' says he, 'an incessant struggle for independence, for power, or for liberty, could not fail to rouse the genius of every citizen—to force the highest talent to the highest station—to animate her councils with a holy zeal—and to afford to her orators all that, according to the profoundest writers of antiquity, is necessary to the sublimest strains of eloquence. "Magna eloquentia sicut flamma materia alitur, a motibus excitatur, urendo clarescit." Hers were not the holiday contests of men who sought to dazzle by the splendour of their diction, the grace of their delivery, the propriety and richness of their imagery. Her debates were on the most serious business which can agitate men—the preservation of national liberty, honour, independence, and glory. The gifts of genius and the perfection of art shed, indeed, a lustre upon the most vigorous exertions of her orators—but the object of their thunders was to stir the energies of the men of Athens, and to make tyrants tremble, or rivals despair. Rome, on the other hand, mistress of the world, at the time when she was most distinguished by genius and eloquence, owned no superior, hated no rival, dreaded no equal. Nations sought her protection, kings bowed before her majesty; the bosom of her sole dominion was disturbed by no struggle for national power, no alarm of foreign danger. While she maintained the authority of her laws over the civilised earth, and embraced under the flattering name of allies those who could no longer resist her arms,

we have not only many arguments upon cases strictly private, and relating to pecuniary matters (those generally called the Ἰδιωτικοὶ), and many upon interesting subjects, more nearly approaching public questions; as the speech against Midias, which relates to an assault on the speaker, but excels in spirit and vehemence, perhaps, all his other efforts; and some which, though personal, involve high considerations of public policy, as that most beautiful and energetic speech against Aristocrates; but we have all his immortal orations upon the state affairs of Greece—the Περὶ Στεφάνου, embracing the history of a twenty years' administration during the most critical period of Grecian story; and the "Philippics," discussing every question of foreign policy, and of the stand to be made by the civilised world against the encroachments of the barbarians. Those speeches were delivered upon subjects the most important and affecting that could be conceived to the whole community; the topics handled in them were of universal application and of perpetual interest. To introduce a general observation, the Latin orator must quit the immediate course of his argument; he must for a moment lose sight of the object in view. But the Athenian can hardly hold too lofty a tone, or carry his view too extensively over the map of human affairs, for the vast range of his subject—the fates of the whole commonwealth of Greece, and the stand to be made by free and polished nations against barbaric tyrants.

After forming and chastening the taste by a diligent study of those perfect models, it is necessary to acquire correct habits of composition in our own language, first by studying the best writers, and next by translating copiously into it from the Greek. This is by far the best exercise that I am acquainted with for at once attaining a pure English diction, and avoiding the tameness and regularity of modern composition. But the English writers who really unlock the rich sources of the language are those who flourished from the end of Elizabeth's to the end of Queen Anne's reign; who used a good Saxon dialect with ease, but correctness and perspicuity—learned in the ancient classics, but only enriching their mother tongue where the Attic could supply its defects—not overlaying it with a profuse pedantic coinage of foreign words—well practised in the old rules of composition, or rather collocation (σύνθεσις), which unite natural ease and variety with absolute harmony, and give the author's ideas to develop themselves with the more truth and simplicity when clothed in the ample folds of inversion, or run from the exuberant to the elliptical without ever being either redundant or obscure. Those great wits had no foreknowledge of such times as succeeded their brilliant age, when styles should arise, and for a season prevail over both purity, and nature, and antique recollections—now meretriciously ornamented, more than half French in the phrase, and to mere figures fantastically sacrificing the sense—now heavily and regularly fashioned as if by the plumb and rule, and by the eye rather than the ear, with a needless profusion of ancient words and flexions, to displace those of our own Saxon, instead of temperately supplying its defects. Least of all could those lights of English eloquence have imagined that men should appear among us professing to teach composition, and ignorant of the whole of its rules, and incapable of relishing the beauties, or indeed apprehending the very genius of the language, should treat its peculiar terms of expression and flexion as so many inaccuracies, and practise their pupils in correcting the faulty English of Addison, and training down to the mechanical rhythm of Johnson the lively and inimitable measures of Bolingbroke.

But in exhorting you deeply to meditate on the beauties of our old English authors, the poets, the moralists, and perhaps more than all these, the preachers of the Augustan age of English letters, do not imagine that I would pass over their great defects when compared with the renowned standards of severe taste in ancient times. Addison may have been pure and elegant; Dryden airy and nervous; Taylor

---

the revolt of a barbarian king, or the contests of bordering nations with each other, prolonged only till she had decided between them, served to amuse her citizens or her senate, without affecting their tranquillity. Her government, though essentially free, was not so popular as the Athenian. The severity of her discipline, and the gravity of her manners, disposed her citizens less to those sudden and powerful emotions which both excited and followed the efforts of the Greek orators. It seems, therefore, reasonable to conclude that the character of Roman eloquence would be distinguished more by art than by passion, by science than by nature. The divisions and animosities of party, no doubt, would operate, and did operate, with their accustomed force. But these are not like the generous flame which animates a whole nation to defend its liberty or its honour. The discussion of a law upon which the national safety could not depend, the question whether this or that general should take the command of an army, whether this or that province should be allotted to a particular minister, whether the petition of a city to be admitted to the privileges of Roman citizens should be granted, or whether some concession should be made to a suppliant king—these, with the exception of the debates on the Catiline conspiracy, and one or two of the "Philippics," form the subjects of a public nature on which the mighty genius and consummate art of Cicero were bestowed. We are not, therefore, surprised to find that those of his orations in which he bears the best comparison with his rival Demosthenes were delivered in the forum in private causes. In some of these may be found examples of perhaps the very highest perfection to which the art can be carried, of clear, acute, convincing argument, of strong natural feeling, and of sudden bursts of passion; always, however, restrained by the predominating influence of a highly-cultivated art—an art little concealed.'"—*Brougham.*

witty and fanciful; Hooker weighty and various; but none of them united force with beauty—the perfection of matter with the most refined and chastened style; and to one charge all, even the most faultless, are exposed—the offence unknown in ancient times, but the besetting sin of later days—they always overdid—never knowing or feeling when they had done enough. In nothing, not even in beauty of collocation and harmony of rhythm, is the vast superiority of the chaste, vigorous, manly style of the Greek orators and writers more conspicuous than in the abstinent use of their prodigious faculties of expression. A single phrase—sometimes a word—and the work is done—the desired impression is made, as it were, with one stroke, there being nothing superfluous interposed to weaken the blow or break its fall. The commanding idea is singled out; it is made to stand forward; all auxiliaries are rejected; as the Emperor Napoleon selected one point in the heart of his adversary's strength, and brought all his power to bear upon that, careless of the other points, which he was sure to carry if he won the centre, as sure to have carried in vain if he left the centre unsubdued. Far otherwise do modern writers make their onset; they resemble rather those campaigners, who fit out twenty little expeditions at a time to be a laughing-stock if they fail, and useless if they succeed; or if they do attack in the right place, so divide their forces, from the dread of leaving any one point unassailed, that they can make no sensible impression where alone it avails them to be felt. It seems the principle of such authors never to leave anything unsaid that can be said on any one topic; to run down every idea they start; to let nothing pass; and leave nothing to the reader, but harass him with anticipating everything that could possibly strike his mind. Compare with this effeminate laxity of speech the manly severity of ancient eloquence; or of him who approached it, by the happy union of natural genius with learned meditation; or of him who so marvellously approached still nearer with only the familiar knowledge of its least perfect ensamples. Mark, I do beseech you, the severe simplicity, the subdued tone of the diction, in the most touching parts of the "old man Eloquent's" loftiest passages. In the oath, when he comes to the burial-place where they repose by whom he is swearing, if ever a grand epithet were allowable, it is here—yet the only one he applies is ἀγαθοὺς. "No! By your forefathers, who for that cause rushed upon destruction at Marathon, and by those who stood in battle array at Platæa, and those who fought the sea-fight at Salamis, and by the warriors of Artemisium, and by all the others who now repose in the sepulchres of the nation—GALLANT men!" When he would compare the effects of the Theban treaty in dispelling the dangers that compassed the state round about, to the swift passing away of a *stormy cloud*, he satisfies himself with two words, ὥσπερ νέφος—the theme of just admiration to succeeding ages; and when he would paint the sudden approach of overwhelming peril to beset the state, he does it by a stroke the picturesque effect of which has not, perhaps, been enough noted—likening it to a *whirlwind* or a *winter torrent*, ὥσπερ σκηπτὸς ἢ χειμάρρους. It is worthy of remark, that in by far the first of all Mr Burke's orations, the passage which is, I believe, universally allowed to be the most striking, owes its effect to a figure twice introduced in close resemblance to these two great expressions, although certainly not in imitation of either; for the original is to be found in Livy's description of Fabius's appearance to Hannibal. Hyder's vengeance is likened to "a black cloud, that hung for a while on the declivities of the mountains," and the people who suffered under its devastations are described as "enveloped in a whirlwind of cavalry." Whoever reads the whole passage will, I think, admit that the effect is almost entirely produced by those two strokes; that the amplifications which accompany them, as the "blackening of the horizon"—the "menacing meteor"—the "storm of unusual fire,"* rather disarm than augment the terrors of the original *black cloud;* and that the "goading spears of the drivers,' and "the trampling of pursuing horses," somewhat abate the fury of the *whirlwind of cavalry.* Δουλεύουσί γε μαστιγούμενοι καὶ στρεβλούμενοι [They are slaves—*lashed and racked*], says the Grecian master, to describe the wretched lot of those who had yielded to the wiles of the conqueror, in the vain hope of securing their liberties in safety. Compare this with the choicest of Mr Burke's invectives of derision and pity upon the same subject—the sufferings of those who made peace with regicide France—and acknowledge the mighty effect of relying upon a single stroke to produce a great effect—if you have the master-hand to give it. "The King of Prussia has hypothecated in trust to the regicides his rich and fertile territories on the Rhine, as a pledge of his zeal and affection to the cause of liberty and equality. He has been robbed with unbounded liberty, and with the most levelling equality. The woods are wasted; the country is ravaged; property is confiscated; and the people are put to bear a double yoke, in the exactions of a tyrannical government, and in the contributions of a hostile conscription." "The Grand Duke of Tuscany, for his early sincerity, for his love of peace, and for his entire confidence in the amity of the assassins of his family, has been complimented with the name of the '*wisest sovereign in Europe.*' This pacific Solomon, or his philo-

* This is incorrect, as the words really used by Burke were, "a storm of *universal* fire blasted every field, consumed every house, destroyed every temple."

sophic cudgelled ministry, cudgelled by English and by French, whose wisdom and philosophy between them have placed Leghorn in the hands of the enemy of the Austrian family, and driven the only profitable commerce of Tuscany from its only port."* Turn now for refreshment to the Athenian artist. "Much, forsooth, did the Oreitæ gain when they yielded to the friends of Philip, and thrust out Euphræus; and much the people of Eretria, when they drove off your ambassadors, and gave themselves up to Kleitarchus! They are now slaves—*lashed and racked*" (Phil. 3). Upon some very rare occasions, indeed, the orator, not content with a single blow, pours himself forth in a full torrent of invective, and then we recognise the man who was said of old to eat *shields* and *steel*—*ἀσπίδας καὶ κατατέλτας ἐσθίων*. But still the effect is produced without repetition or diffuseness. I am not aware of any such expanded passage as the invective in the *Περὶ Στεφάνου* against those who had betrayed the various states of Greece to Philip. It is, indeed, a noble passage; one of the most brilliant, perhaps the most highly coloured of any in Demosthenes; but it is as condensed and rapid as it is rich and varied: "Base and fawning creatures, wretches who have mutilated the glory each of his own native land—toasting away their liberties to the health first of Philip, then of Alexander; measuring their happiness by their gluttony and debauchery, but utterly overthrowing those rights of freemen, and that independence of any master, which the Greeks of former days regarded as the test and the summit of all felicity."† This requires no contrast to make its merits shine forth; but compare it with any of Cicero's invectives—that, for instance, in the third Catilinarian, against the conspirators, where he attacks them regularly under six different heads, and in above twenty times as many words; and ends with the known and very moderate jest of their commander keeping "Scortorum cohortem Prætoriam."

The great poet of modern Italy, Dante, approached nearest to the ancients in the quality of which I have been speaking. In his finest passages you rarely find an epithet; hardly ever more than one; and never two efforts to embody one idea. "A guisa di Leon quando si posa." ["Like the lion when he lays himself down"], is the single trait by which he compares the dignified air of a stern personage to the expression of the lion slowly laying him down. It is remarkable that Tasso copies the verse entire, but he destroys its whole effect by filling up the majestic idea, adding this line, "Girando gli occhi e non movendo il passo" ["Casting around his eyes, but not hastening his pace"]. A better illustration could not easily be found of the difference between the ancient and the modern style.* Another is furnished by a later imitator of the same great master. I know no passage of the "Divina Commedia" more excursive than the description of evening in the Purgatorio; yet the poet is content with somewhat enlarging on a single thought—the tender recollections which that hour of meditation gives the traveller, at the fall of the first night he is to pass away from home, when he hears the distant knell of the expiring day. Gray adopts the idea of the knell in nearly the words of the original, and adds eight other circumstances to it, presenting a kind of ground-plan, or at least a catalogue, an accurate enumeration (like a natural historian's) of every one particular belonging to nightfall, so as wholly to exhaust the subject, and leave nothing to the imagination of the reader. Dante's six verses, too, have but one epithet, *dolci*, applied to *amici*. Gray has thirteen or fourteen; some of them mere repetitions of the same idea which the verb or the substantive conveys —as *drowsy* tinkling *lulls*—the *moping* owl *complains*—the ploughman *plods* his *weary* way. Surely, when we contrast the simple and commanding majesty of the ancient writers with the superabundance and diffusion of the exhaustive method, we may be tempted to feel that there lurks some alloy of bitterness in the excess of sweets. This was so fully recognised by the wise ancients, that it became a proverb among them, as we learn from an epigram still preserved.

Εἰς τὴν μετριότητα.

Πᾶν τὸ περιττὸν ἄκαιρον, ἐπεὶ λόγος ἐστὶ παλαιὸς,
Ὡς καὶ τοῦ μέλιτος τὸ πλέον ἐστὶ χολή.

["TO MODERATION.
"All excess is inappropriate; hence the proverb,
Too much even of honey turns to gall."]

In forming the taste by much contemplation of those antique models, and acquiring the habits of easy and chaste composition, it must not be imagined that all the labour of the orator is ended, or that he may then dauntless and fluent enter upon his office in the public assembly. Much preparation is still required before each exertion, if rhetorical excellence is aimed at. I

* "Lord Brougham does injustice to Mr Burke in this quotation. The passage, instead of being one of the 'choicest,' is one of the most careless, in point of style, to be found in the Regicide Peace."—*C. A. Goodrich.*

† "The object of chief abhorrence to the old Greeks is remarkably expressed in this passage: *δεσπέτης* is the correlative of *δοῦλος*; and the meaning of *δεσπότην ἔχειν αὑτῶν* is, 'having an owner or proprietor of themselves,' that is, 'being the property, the chattels of any one;' and this they justly deemed the last of human miseries. The addition of the cart-whip, and a tropical climate, would not probably have been esteemed by them an alleviation of the lot of slavery."—*Brougham.*

* Lord Brougham here cites a number of passages from Dante, as specimens of the brief energy of his descriptions.

should lay it down as a rule, admitting of no exception, that a man will speak well in proportion as he has written much; and that with equal talents, he will be the finest extempore speaker, when no time for preparing is allowed, who has prepared himself the most sedulously when he had an opportunity of delivering a premeditated speech. All the exceptions which I have ever heard cited to this principle are apparent ones only; proving nothing more than that some few men of rare genius have become great speakers without preparation; in no wise showing that with preparation they would not have reached a much higher pitch of excellence. The admitted superiority of the ancients in all oratorial accomplishments is the best proof of my position; for their careful preparation is undeniable; nay, in Demosthenes (of whom Quintilian says that his style indicates more premeditation—*plus curæ*—than Cicero's) we can trace, by the recurrence of the same passage, with progressive improvements in different speeches, how nicely he polished the more exquisite parts of his compositions. I could point out favourite passages occurring as often as three several times with variations, and manifest amendment.

I am now requiring not merely great preparation while the speaker is learning his art, but after he has accomplished his education. The most splendid effort of the most mature orator will be always finer for being previously elaborated with much care. There is, no doubt, a charm in extemporaneous elocution, derived from the appearance of artless, unpremeditated effusion, called forth by the occasion, and so adapting itself to its exigencies, which may compensate the manifold defects incident to this kind of composition: that which is inspired by the unforeseen circumstances of the moment, will be of necessity suited to those circumstances in the choice of the topics, and pitched in the tone of the execution, to the feelings upon which it is to operate. These are great virtues: it is another to avoid the besetting vice of modern oratory—the overdoing everything—the exhaustive method—which an off-hand speaker has no time to fall into, and he accordingly will take only the grand and effective view; nevertheless, in oratorical merit, such effusions must needs be very inferior; much of the pleasure they produce depends upon the hearer's surprise, that in such circumstances anything can be delivered at all, rather than upon his deliberate judgment, that he has heard anything very excellent in itself. We may rest assured that the highest reaches of the art, and without any necessary sacrifice of natural effect, can only be attained by him who well considers, and maturely prepares, and often-times sedulously corrects and refines his oration. Such preparation is quite consistent with the introduction of passages prompted by the occasion, nor will the transition from the one to the other be perceptible in the execution of a practised master. I have known attentive and skilful hearers completely deceived in this matter, and taking for extemporaneous passages which previously existed in manuscript, and were pronounced without the variation of a particle or a pause. Thus, too, we are told by Cicero, in one of his epistles, that having to make, in Pompey's presence, a speech, after Crassus had very unexpectedly taken a particular line of argument, he exerted himself, and it appears successfully, in a marvellous manner, mightily assisted in what he said extempore by his habit of rhetorical preparation, and introducing skilfully, as the inspiration of the moment, all his favourite commonplaces, with some of which, as we gather from a good-humoured joke at his own expense, Crassus had interfered: "But for myself, good gods, how I launched out before my new auditor, Pompey! Then, if ever, I had an abundant supply of rounded sentences, graceful transitions, striking rhetorical proofs, and amplifications to illustrate and confirm my sentiments. Why should I say more? Shouts of applause followed. My subject was, the dignity of the senate, the concord of the knights, the union of all Italy, the expiring remains of the conspiracy—corruption destroyed, peace established. You know how I can raise my voice on these topics; and I now say the less, because it swelled so loud that I should think you might have heard it even at the distance you are off!" (Ep. ad Att., i. 14.)

II. If, from contemplating the means of acquiring eloquence, we turn to the noble purposes to which it may be made subservient, we at once perceive its prodigious importance to the best interests of mankind. The greatest masters of the art have concurred, and upon the greatest occasion of its display, in pronouncing that its estimation depends on the virtuous and rational use made of it. Let their sentiments be engraved on your memory in their own pure and appropriate diction. "It is well," says Æschines, "that the intellect should choose the best objects, and that the education and eloquence of the orator should obtain the assent of his hearers; but if not, that sound judgment should be preferred to mere speech." "It is not," says his illustrious antagonist, "the language of the orator or the modulation of his voice that deserves your praise, but his seeking the same interests and objects with the body of the people."

It is but reciting the ordinary praises of the art of persuasion to remind you how sacred truths may be most ardently promulgated at the altar—the cause of oppressed innocence be most powerfully defended—the march of wicked rulers be most triumphantly resisted—defiance the most terrible be hurled at the oppressor's head. In great convulsions of public affairs, or in bringing about salutary changes, every one

confesses how important an ally eloquence must be. But in peaceful times, when the progress of events is slow and even as the silent and unheeded pace of time, and the jars of a mighty tumult in foreign and domestic concerns can no longer be heard, then, too, she flourishes—protectress of liberty—patroness of improvement—guardian of all the blessings that can be showered upon the mass of human kind; nor is her form ever seen but on ground consecrated to free institutions. "Pacis comes, otiique socia, et jam bene constitutæ reipublicæ alumna eloquentia" ["Eloquence is the companion of peace and the associate of leisure; it is trained up under the auspices of a well-established republic."] To me, calmly revolving these things, such pursuits seem far more noble objects of ambition than any upon which the vulgar herd of busy men lavish prodigal their restless exertions. To diffuse useful information—to further intellectual refinement, sure forerunner of moral improvement—to hasten the coming of the bright day when the dawn of general knowledge shall chase away the lazy, lingering mists, even from the base of the great social pyramid—this, indeed, is a high calling, in which the most splendid talents and consummate virtue may well press onward eager to bear a part. I know that I speak in a place consecrated by the pious wisdom of ancient times to the instruction of but a select portion of the community. Yet from this classic ground have gone forth those whose genius, not their ancestry, ennobled them; whose incredible merits have opened to all ranks the temple of science; whose illustrious example has made the humblest emulous to climb steeps no longer inaccessible, and enter the unfolded gates, burning in the sun. I speak in that city where Black having once taught, and Watt learned, the grand experiment was afterward made in our day, and with entire success; to demonstrate that the highest intellectual cultivation is perfectly compatible with the daily cares and toils of working men; to show by thousands of living examples that a keen relish for the most sublime truths of science belongs alike to every class of mankind.

To promote this, of all objects the most important, men of talents and of influence I rejoice to behold pressing forward in every part of the empire; but I wait with impatient anxiety to see the same course pursued by men of high station in society, and by men of rank in the world of letters. It should seem as if these felt some little lurking jealousy, and those were somewhat scared by feelings of alarm—the one and the other surely alike groundless. No man of science needs fear to see the day when scientific excellence shall be too vulgar a commodity to bear a high price. The more widely knowledge is spread, the more will they be prized whose happy lot it is to extend its bounds by discovering new truths, or multiply its uses by inventing new modes of applying it in practice. Their numbers will indeed be increased, and among them more Watts and more Franklins will be enrolled among the lights of the world, in proportion as more thousands of the working classes, to which Franklin and Watt belonged, have their thoughts turned toward philosophy; but the order of discoverers and inventors will still be a select few, and the only material variation in their proportion to the bulk of mankind will be, that the mass of the ignorant multitude being progressively diminished, the body of those will be incalculably increased who are worthy to admire genius, and able to bestow upon its possessors an immortal fame.

To those, too, who feel alarmed as statesmen, and friends of existing establishments, I would address a few words of comfort. Real knowledge never promoted either turbulence or unbelief; but its progress is the forerunner of liberality and enlightened toleration. Whoso dreads these, let him tremble; for he may be well assured that their day is at length come, and must put to sudden flight the evil spirits of tyranny and persecution which haunted the long night now gone down the sky. As men will no longer suffer themselves to be led blindfolded in ignorance, so will they no more yield to the vile principle of judging and treating their fellow-creatures, not according to the intrinsic merit of their actions, but according to the accidental and involuntary coincidence of their opinions. The great truth has finally gone forth to all the ends of the earth, THAT MAN SHALL NO MORE RENDER ACCOUNT TO MAN FOR HIS BELIEF, OVER WHICH HE HAS HIMSELF NO CONTROL. Henceforward, nothing shall prevail upon us to praise or to blame any one for that which he can no more change than he can the hue of his skin or the height of his stature.* Henceforward, treating with entire respect those who conscientiously differ from ourselves, the only practical effect of the difference will be to make us enlighten the ignorance on one side or the other from which it springs, by instructing them, if it be theirs; ourselves, if it be our own, to the end that the only kind of unanimity may be produced which is desirable among rational beings—the agreement proceeding from full conviction after the freest discussion. Far then, very far, from the universal spread of knowledge being the object of just apprehension to those who watch over the peace of the country, or have a deep interest in the permanence of her institutions, its sure effect will be the removal of the only dangers that threaten the public tranquillity, and the addition of all that is wanting to confirm her internal strength.

Let me therefore indulge in the hope that

* This has been looked upon by many as a hasty utterance, contradicting the tenor of Scripture teaching.

among the illustrious youths whom this ancient kingdom, famed alike for its nobility and its learning, has produced, to continue her fame through after-ages, possibly among those I now address, there may be found some one—I ask no more—willing to give a bright example to other nations in a path yet untrodden, by taking the lead of his fellow-citizens, not in frivolous amusements, nor in the degrading pursuits of the ambitious vulgar, but in the truly noble task of enlightening the mass of his countrymen, and of leaving his own name no longer encircled, as heretofore, with barbaric splendour, or attached to courtly gewgaws, but illustrated by the honours most worthy of our rational nature—coupled with the diffusion of knowledge—and gratefully pronounced through all ages by millions whom his wise beneficence has rescued from ignorance and vice. To him I will say, "Homines ad Deos nullâ re propius accedunt quam salutem hominibus dando: nihil habet nec fortuna tua majus quam ut possis, nec natura tua melius quam ut velis servare quamplurimos" [In nothing do men approach more nearly to the Divinity than in ministering to the safety of their fellow-men; so that fortune cannot give you anything greater than the ability, or nature anything better than the desire, to extend relief to the greatest possible number]. This is the true mark for the aim of all who either prize the enjoyment of pure happiness, or set a right value upon a high and unsullied renown. And if the benefactors of mankind, when they rest from their pious labours, shall be permitted to enjoy hereafter, as an appropriate reward of their virtue, the privilege of looking down upon the blessings with which their toils and sufferings have clothed the scene of their former existence, do not vainly imagine that, in a state of exalted purity and wisdom, the founders of mighty dynasties, the conquerors of new empires, or the more vulgar crowd of evil-doers, who have sacrificed to their own aggrandisement the good of their fellow-creatures, will be gratified by contemplating the monuments of their inglorious fame—theirs will be the delight—theirs the triumph—who can trace the remote effects of their enlightened benevolence in the improved condition of their species, and exult in the reflection that the prodigious change they now survey, with eyes that age and sorrow can make dim no more—of knowledge become power—virtue sharing in the dominion—superstition trampled under foot—tyranny driven from the world—are the fruits, precious, though costly, and though late reaped, yet long-enduring, of all the hardships and all the hazards they encountered here below!

ON LAW REFORM, 1828.*

After a long interval of various fortune, and filled with vast events, we are again called to the vast labour of surveying and amending our laws. For this task it well becomes us to begird ourselves, as the honest representatives of the people. Despatch and vigour are imperiously demanded; but that deliberation, too, must not be lost sight of which so mighty an enterprise requires. When we shall have done the work we may fairly challenge the utmost approval of our constituents, for in none other have they so deep a stake.

In pursuing the course which I now invite you to enter upon, I avow that I look for the co-operation of the king's Government. But whether I have the support of the ministers or no, to the House I look, with confident expectation, that it will control them and assist me; if I go too far, checking my progress; if I go too fast, abating my speed; but heartily and honestly helping me, in the best and greatest work which the hands of the lawgiver can undertake. The course is clear before us; the race is glorious to run. You have the power of sending your name down through all times, illustrated by deeds of higher fame and more useful import than ever were done within these walls. You saw the greatest warrior of the age—conqueror of Italy—humbler of Germany—terror of the North—you saw him account all his matchless victories poor, compared with the triumph which you are now in a condition to win!—saw him contemn the fickleness of fortune, while, in despite of her, he could pronounce his memorable boast—"I shall go down to posterity with my code in my hand!" You have vanquished him in the field; strive now to rival him in the sacred arts of peace! Outstrip him as a lawgiver, whom in arms you overcame! The lustre of the regency will be eclipsed by the more solid and enduring splendour of the reign. The praise which false courtiers feigned for our Edwards and Harrys—the Justinians of their day—will be the just tribute of the wise and good to that monarch under whose sway so mighty an undertaking shall be accomplished. Of a truth, sceptres are chiefly to be envied, for that they bestow the power of thus conquering and ruling. It was the boast of Augustus—it formed part of the glare in which the perfidies of his earlier years were lost—that he found Rome of brick and left it of marble; a praise not unworthy a great prince, and to which the present reign has its claims also. But how much nobler will be our sovereign's boast when he shall have it to say that he found law dear and left it cheap; found it a sealed book—left it an open letter; found it the patrimony of the rich—left it the inheritance of the poor; found it the two-edged sword of craft and oppression—left it the staff of honesty and the shield of innocence! To me, much reflecting on these things, it has always seemed a worthier honour to be the instrument of making you bestir yourselves in this high

* Delivered in the House of Commons, Feb. 7, 1828.

matter than to enjoy all that office can bestow—office, of which the patronage would be irksome encumbrance, the emoluments superfluous, to one, content, with the rest of his industrious fellow-citizens, that his own hands minister to his wants: and as for the power supposed to follow it—I have lived nearly half a century, and I have learned that power and place may be severed. But one power I do prize—that of being the advocate of my countrymen here, and their fellow-labourer elsewhere, in those things which concern the best interests of mankind. That power I know full well no government can give—no change take away.

ON PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.*

We stand in a truly critical position. If we reject the bill, through fear of being thought to be intimidated, we may lead the life of retirement and quiet, but the hearts of the millions of our fellow-citizens are gone for ever; their affections are estranged; we and our order, and its privileges, are the objects of the people's hatred, as the only obstacles which stand between them and the gratification of their most passionate desire. The whole body of the aristocracy must expect to share this fate, and be exposed to feelings such as these. For I hear it constantly said, that the bill is rejected by all the aristocracy. Favour, and a good number of supporters, our adversaries allow, it has among the people; the ministers, too, are for it; but the aristocracy, say they, is strenuously opposed to it. I broadly deny this silly, thoughtless assertion. What, my Lords! the aristocracy set themselves in a mass against the people—they who sprang from the people—are inseparably connected with the people—are supported by the people—are the natural chiefs of the people! They set themselves against the people, for whom peers are ennobled—bishops consecrated—kings anointed—the people, to serve whom Parliament itself has an existence, and the monarchy and all its institutions are constituted, and without whom none of them could exist for an hour! The assertion of unreflecting men is too monstrous to be endured—as a member of this House, I deny it with indignation. I repel it with scorn, as a calumny upon us all. And yet there are those who even within these walls speak of the bill augmenting so much the strength of the democracy as to endanger the other orders of the state; and so they charge its authors with promoting anarchy and rapine. Why, my Lords, have its authors nothing to fear from democratic spoliation? The fact is, that there are members of the present cabinet who possess, one or two of them alone, far more property than any two administrators within my recollection; and all of them have ample wealth. I need hardly say, I include not myself, who have little or none. But even of myself I will say, that whatever I have depends on the stability of existing institutions; and it is as dear to me as the princely possessions of any among you. Permit me to say, that, in becoming a member of your House, I staked my all on the aristocratic institutions of the state. I abandoned certain wealth, a large income, and much real power in the state, for an office of great trouble, heavy responsibility, and very uncertain duration. I say, I gave up substantial power for the shadow of it, and for distinction depending upon accident. I quitted the elevated station of a representative for Yorkshire, and a leading member of the House of Commons. I descended from a position quite lofty enough to gratify any man's ambition; and my lot became bound up in the stability of this House. Then, have I not a right to throw myself on your justice, and to desire that you will not put in jeopardy all I have now left?

But the populace only, the rabble, the ignoble vulgar, are for the bill! Then, what is the Duke of Norfolk, Earl Marshal of England? What the Duke of Devonshire? What the Duke of Bedford! [Cries of "Order" from the Opposition.] I am aware it is irregular in any noble lord that is a friend to the measure; its adversaries are patiently suffered to call peers even by their Christian and surnames. Then I shall be as regular as they were, and ask, does my friend John Russell, my friend William Cavendish, my friend Harry Vane, belong to the mob, or to the aristocracy? Have they no possessions? Are they modern names? Are they wanting in Norman blood, or whatever else you pride yourselves on? The idea is too ludicrous to be seriously refuted; that the bill is only a favourite with the democracy is a delusion so wild as to point a man's destiny towards St Luke's. Yet many, both here and elsewhere, by dint of constantly repeating the same cry, or hearing it repeated, have almost made themselves believe that none of the nobility are for the measure. A noble friend of mine has had the curiosity to examine the list of peers opposing and supporting it, with respect to the dates of their creation, and the result is somewhat remarkable. A large majority of the peers created before Mr Pitt's time are for the bill; the bulk of those against it are of recent creation; and, if you divide the whole into two classes, those ennobled before the reign of George III. and those since, of the former fifty-six are friends and only twenty-one enemies of the reform. So much for the vain and saucy boast that the real nobility of the country are against reform. I have dwelt upon this matter more than its intrinsic importance deserves, only through my desire to set right the fact, and to vindicate the ancient aristocracy from a groundless imputation.

My Lords, I do not disguise the intense solicitude which I feel for the event of this debate

* Delivered in the House of Lords, October 7, 1831.

because I know full well that the peace of the country is involved in the issue. I cannot look without dismay at the rejection of the measure. But, grievous as may be the consequences of a temporary defeat—temporary it can only be, for its ultimate, and even speedy success, is certain—nothing can now stop it. Do not suffer yourselves to be persuaded that even if the present ministers were driven from the helm, any one could steer you through the troubles which surround you without reform. But our successors would take up the task in circumstances far less auspicious. Under them, you would be fain to grant a bill, compared with which the one we offer you is moderate indeed. Hear the parable of the Sibyl, for it conveys a wise and wholesome moral. She now appears at your gate, and offers you mildly the volumes—the precious volumes of wisdom and peace. The price she asks is reasonable: to restore the franchise, which, without any bargain, you ought voluntarily to give; you refuse her terms—her moderate terms—she darkens the porch no longer. But soon, for you cannot do without her wares, you call her back; again she comes, but with diminished treasures; the leaves of the book are in part torn away by lawless hands—in part defaced with characters of blood. But the prophetic maid has risen in her demands—it is parliaments by the year—it is vote by the ballot—it is suffrage by the million! From this you turn away indignant, and for the second time she departs. Beware of her third coming, for the treasure you must have; and what price she may next demand, who shall tell? It may even be the mace which rests upon that woolsack. What may follow your course of obstinacy, if persisted in, I cannot take upon me to predict, nor do I wish to conjecture. But this I know full well, that, as sure as man is mortal, and to err is human, justice deferred enhances the price at which you must purchase safety and peace; nor can you expect to gather in another crop than they did who went before you, if you persevere in their utterly abominable husbandry of sowing injustice and reaping rebellion.

But among the awful considerations that now bow down my mind, there is one which stands pre-eminent above the rest. You are the highest judicature in the realm; you sit here as judge, and decide all causes, civil and criminal, without appeal. It is a judge's first duty never to pronounce sentence in the most trifling case without hearing. Will you make this the exception? Are you really prepared to determine, but not to *hear* the mighty cause upon which a nation's hopes and fears hang? You are. Then beware of your decision! Rouse not, I beseech you, a peace-loving, but a resolute people; alienate not from your body the affections of a whole empire. As your friend, as the friend of my order, as the friend of my country, as the faithful servant of my sovereign, I counsel you to assist with the uttermost efforts in preserving the peace, and upholding and perpetuating the constitution. Therefore I pray and exhort you not to reject this measure. By all you hold most dear—by all the ties that bind every one of us to our common order and our common country, I solemnly adjure you—I warn you—I implore you—yea, on my bended knees, I supplicate you—reject not this bill!

[This theatrical conclusion, it has been remarked, has excited the derision of some, and it is to be feared that Lord Brougham, in the scene here enacted, was in perilous proximity to the region of the ridiculous.]

DR ANDREW THOMSON.

1779-1831.

SLAVE EMANCIPATION.

If our rulers and legislators will undertake to emancipate the slaves, and do it as it ought to be done, immediately, I beg those who set themselves against such a measure, to point out the danger, and to prove it. The *onus* lies upon *them*. And what evidence do they give us? Where is it to be found? In what circumstances shall we discover it? From what principles and probabilities shall we infer it? We must not have mere hypothesis—mere allegations—mere fancied horrors, dressed up in frightful language. We must have proof to substantiate, in some good measure, their theory of rebellion, warfare, and blood. If any such thing exists, let them produce it. Sure am I it is not in the conduct which the slaves have hitherto maintained. Notwithstanding all that these poor beings have suffered from the exactions and ruthlessness of their oppressors, how seldom has any case of insurrection occurred, and how easily have all such tumults been put down! And while we may expect a more cheerful submission after they are made free, than can be looked for so long as they are in cruel bondage, the same strength that has heretofore coerced them remains to coerce them still. We are told, indeed, to look to Hayti as furnishing an example of the horrors that would

be realised in our colonies, if the slaves were immediately set free. But it appears to me that the case of Hayti, so far from being an instance in favour of the alarmists, is an instance that may be confidently appealed to in support of the more quiet expectations which we entertain of the result. The disturbances in that island, the insubordination and bloodshed which prevailed in it, were owing to the white men, who introduced the revolutionary principles of France, liberated the slaves to serve their own ambitious or revengeful purposes, and instigated them to the atrocities that were committed. But when the black population were left to themselves, they at length settled down into social order and regular government. Look at the Haytians as they are now, and have been for many years, and you see a peaceable, industrious, prosperous, and, as far as can be in their circumstances, a happy as well as independent community!

It is quite absurd and delusive to say that *eight hundred thousand* slaves are to be let loose at once upon the white population. This is calculated to alarm the ignorant and the timid; but it is in reality a gross misstatement. The slaves are not to be let loose upon their masters. They are merely to be made free, and are still to be made subject to that legal and adequate control which it is the duty of our government to impose upon all its subjects, in every part of the British dominions, and which it will especially exercise where the necessity for it is great and pressing. Then, from the 800,000, it is fair to subtract the half as consisting of females, and whom we cannot surely dread as very formidable in their power of resisting the constituted authorities, or the military force. Still further, subtract the male children under twelve years of age, who may be classed with the women as to their inability to frighten or annoy either the planters or his Majesty's troops. Yet again, subtract all who are aged and sickly, or of docile disposition and submissive habits, attached to the masters that have been kind and merciful to them, and who would either not engage to revolt, or assist in quelling it. Once more, subtract that portion who have, in spite of all obstructions, imbibed the principles and spirit of Christianity, who would employ their influence and their efforts to prevent every sort of rapine, and to give to the abolition its full moral effect—and whom, though brethren in Christ Jesus, your *gradualists* would consign to unrequited toil, to undeserved suffering, to cruel bondage, during the remainder of their lives. Make all these deductions, and of the 800,000 slaves who, in the mass, are so apt to strike people's minds with terror, you will leave a number that the planters and the government should be ashamed to confess that they could not cope with, or preserve in due submission and in tranquillity—especially as they happen to be in numerous divisions, separated from each other by sea, and therefore unable to concentrate their hostility, or to unite their efforts, if they should choose to rebel.

I request the meeting now to turn their attention to the state of the free black population, which forms an important element, though too little heeded, in the argument I am now addressing to you. The grand distinction in the colonies is between the white people and the people of colour. The white people treat all the people of colour with perfect contempt. And the latter have every reason to feel and show resentment to the former. But those of them who are free have been guilty of no attempts to overturn a dominion, which they must every day feel to be of the most galling kind. And think not that it is on account of their being less considerable in number. On the contrary, the white people, in the crown and chartered colonies, are only 119,000, whereas the free blacks amount to no fewer than 144,000. But, sir, in the character and condition of the free blacks you will find a solution of the fact, and you will find, moreover, an additional security against all the evils which have been so eagerly pressed upon us, as likely to result from an immediate and total abolition. I have told you their number, 144,000. Think next of their wealth. That is allowed to be very great. In some places their opulence rivals or surpasses that of the white people. And thus they have a stake in the country, which will make them more than ordinarily anxious to repress even the beginnings of any tumult, from which they could look for nothing but the plunder and destruction of their property. They are more than opulent; many of them are remarkably intelligent, men of good education, of liberal ideas, conversant with the government of states, and with whatever contributes to the public weal. They have even established newspapers, in which they discuss the very question of the abolition of slavery, and advocate the measure both with zeal and talent, and in other respects display an extent of knowledge, a power of reasoning, and a tone of moral and religious feeling, which might be transferred with considerable advantage into a certain portion of the newspaper press of Edinburgh. Besides this, the free blacks are distinguished by their loyalty, and their decided attachment to the mother country—so much so, that when, in consequence of the interference of our government, the white colonists threatened to rebel, they were told, through the medium of the journals I have alluded to, that if they did so, they might be assured that they would be opposed by the free blacks, and by all the coloured population to a man, in defence of British sovereignty. And in addition to their loyalty, consider their general good conduct. I

do not hold them out as free from many and great vices. They retain, in some instances, the greatest of all vices, that of keeping slaves. This, however, arises, in a great measure, it is probable, from the external circumstances in which they find themselves, by reason of the general system that prevails around them. And it augurs well for their being ready to renounce that abominable nuisance, that their newspapers plead for emancipation, and that they are superior to the white population as to public morals. By a return to the House of Commons of the number of criminal prosecutions in Jamaica, we perceive that the criminal prosecutions of the whites were, to those of the free blacks, in the proportion of *three* to *one*. Nay, but, my friends, you have only got one-half of the interesting fact: for I have to add, that the white population is, to that of the free blacks, nearly as *one* to *three*—there being of free blacks 40,000, and of whites only 15,000! Taking into account the circumstances I have just stated respecting the free blacks—their number, their wealth, their loyalty, their general character—every one must see that we may safely look to that portion of the West India community as standing between the colonists and all danger that may be apprehended from the emancipation of the slaves; and coupling this with the other particulars to which I formerly adverted, it does appear to me that we have the amplest security for that measure, how soon soever it may be carried, being as bloodless and peaceable as our hearts could desire. I have no fear—no, not the shadow of it—that any of the dreaded mischiefs will ensue from the course of proceeding that we are pressing on the legislature. In my conscience I deem them all chimerical, and got up chiefly for the purpose of deterring us from insisting on that act of simple but imperative justice which we call upon the British Parliament to perform.

But if you push me, and still urge the argument of insurrection and bloodshed, for which you are far more indebted to fancy than to fact, as I have shown you, then I say, be it so. I repeat that maxim, taken from a heathen book, but pervading the whole Book of God, "Fiat justitia—ruat cœlum." Righteousness, sir, is the pillar of the universe. Break down that pillar, and the universe falls into ruin and desolation. But preserve it, and though the fair fabric may sustain partial dilapidation, it may be rebuilt and repaired—it *will* be rebuilt, and repaired, and restored to all its pristine strength, and magnificence, and beauty. If there must be violence, let it even come, for it will soon pass away—let it come and rage its little hour, since it is to be succeeded by lasting freedom, and prosperity, and happiness. Give me the hurricane rather than the pestilence. Give me the hurricane, with its thunder, and its lightning, and its tempest; give me the hurricane, with its partial and temporary devastations, awful though they be; give me the hurricane, with its purifying, healthful, salutary effects; give me that hurricane, infinitely rather than the noisome pestilence, whose path is never crossed, whose silence is never disturbed, whose progress is never arrested, by one sweeping blast from the heavens; which walks peacefully and sullenly through the length and breadth of the land, breathing poison into every heart, and carrying havoc into every home, enervating all that is strong, defacing all that is beautiful, and casting its blight over the fairest and happiest scenes of human life—and which, from day to day, and from year to year, with intolerant and interminable malignity, sends its thousands and its tens of thousands of hapless victims into the ever-yawning and never-satisfied grave!

INFIDELITY.

It is amidst trials and sorrows that infidelity appears in its justest and most frightful aspect. When subjected to the multifarious ills which flesh is heir to, what is there to uphold our spirit but the discoveries and the prospects that are unfolded to us by revelation? What, for this purpose, can be compared with the belief that everything here below is under the management of infinite wisdom and goodness, and that there is an immortality of bliss awaiting us in another world? If this conviction be taken away, what is it that we can have recourse to, on which the mind may patiently and safely repose in the season of adversity? where is the balm which I may apply with effect to my wounded heart, after I have rejected the aid of the Almighty Physician? Impose upon me whatever hardships you please; give me nothing but the bread of sorrow to eat; take from me the friends in whom I had placed my confidence; lay me in the cold hut of poverty, and on the thorny bed of disease; set death before me in all its terrors; do all this,—only let me trust in my Saviour, and "pillow my head on the bosom of Omnipotence," and I will "fear no evil,"—I will "rise superior to affliction,"—I will "rejoice in my tribulation." But let infidelity interpose between God and my soul, and draw its impenetrable veil over a future state of existence, and limit all my trust to the creatures of a day, and all my expectations to a few years as uncertain as they are short; and how shall I bear up with fortitude or with cheerfulness, under the burden of distress? Or where shall I find one drop of consolation to put into the bitter draught which has been given me to drink? I look over the whole range of this wilderness in which I dwell, but I see not one covert from the storm, nor one leaf for the healing of my soul, nor one cup of cold water to refresh me in the weariness and the faintings of my pilgrimage.

THOMAS CHALMERS.*

1780-1847.

ON THE SYMPATHY THAT IS FELT FOR MAN IN THE DISTANT PLACES OF CREATION.†

I HAVE already attempted at full length to establish the position that the infidel argument of astronomers goes to expunge a natural perfection from the character of God, even that wondrous property of His, by which He, at the same instant of time, can bend a close and a careful attention on a countless diversity of objects, and diffuse the intimacy of His power and of His presence, from the greatest to the minutest and most insignificant of them all. I also adverted shortly to this other circumstance, that it went to impair a moral attribute of the Deity. It goes to impair the benevolence of His nature. It is saying much for the benevolence of God to say that a single world, or a single system, is not enough for it—that it must have the spread of a mightier region, on which it may pour forth a tide of exuberancy throughout all its provinces—that as far as our vision can carry us, it has strewed immensity with the floating receptacles of life, and has stretched over each of them the garniture of such a sky as mantles our own habitation—and that even from distances which are far beyond the reach of human eye, the songs of gratitude and praise may now be arising to the one God, who sits surrounded by the regards of His one great and universal family.

Now it is saying much for the benevolence of God, to say that it sends forth these wide and distant emanations over the surface of a territory so ample, that the world we inhabit, lying imbedded as it does amidst so much surrounding greatness, shrinks into a point that to the universal eye might appear to be almost imperceptible. But does it not add to the power and to the perfection of this universal eye, that at the very moment it is taking a comprehensive survey of the vast, it can fasten a steady and undistracted attention on each minute and separate portion of it; that at the very moment it is looking at all worlds, it can look most pointedly and most intelligently to each of them; that at the very moment it sweeps the field of immensity, it can settle all the earnestness of its regards upon every distinct handbreadth of that field; that at the very moment at which it embraces the totality of existence, it can send a most thorough and penetrating inspection into each of its details, and into every one of its endless diversities? You cannot fail to perceive how much this adds to the power of the all-seeing eye. Tell me, then, if it do not add as much perfection to the benevolence of God, that while it is expatiating over the vast field of created things, there is not one portion of the field overlooked by it; that while it scatters blessings over the whole of an infinite range, it causes them to descend in a shower of plenty on every separate habitation; that while His arm is underneath and round about all worlds, He enters within the precincts of every one of them, and gives a care and a tenderness to each individual of their teeming population. Oh! does not the

---

* "His voice is neither strong nor melodious, his gestures neither graceful nor easy, but, on the contrary, extremely rude and awkward; his pronunciation is not only broadly national, but broadly provincial, distorting almost every word he utters into some barbarous novelty, which, had his hearers leisure to think of such things, might be productive of an effect at once ludicrous and offensive in a singular degree; but, of a truth, these are things which no listener can attend to. This great preacher stands before him, armed with all the weapons of the most commanding eloquence, and swaying all around him with his imperial rule. At first, indeed, there is nothing to make one suspect what riches are in store; he commences in a low, drawling key, which has not even the merit of being solemn, and advances from sentence to sentence, and from paragraph to paragraph, while you seek in vain to catch a single echo that gives promise of that which is to come. There is, on the contrary, an appearance of constraint about him that affects and distresses you. You are afraid that his chest is weak, and that even the slightest exertion he makes may be too much for it. But then, with what tenfold richness does this dim, preliminary curtain make the glories of his eloquence to shine forth, when the heated spirit at length shakes from it its chill, confining fetters, and bursts out elate and rejoicing in the full splendour of its disimprisoned wings. . . . I have heard men deliver sermons far better arranged in regard to argument, and have heard very many deliver sermons far more uniform in eloquence, both of conception and of style; but most unquestionably I have never heard, either in England or Scotland, or in any other country, any preacher whose eloquence is capable of producing an effect so strong and irresistible as his."—*Peter's Letters to his Kinsfolk.*

When published, his "Sermons on Astronomy," says Hazlitt, "ran like wild-fire through the country, were the darlings of watering-places, were laid in the windows of inns, and were to be met with in all places of public resort." "We remember finding the volume in the orchard at Burford Bridge, near Boxhill, and passing a whole and very delightful morning in reading it, without quitting the shade of an apple-tree."

† "I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance" (Luke xv. 7).

God, who is said to be love, shed over this attribute of His its finest illustration, when, while He sits in the highest heaven, and pours out His fulness on the whole subordinate domain of nature and of providence, He bows a pitying regard on the very humblest of His children, and sends His reviving Spirit into every heart, and cheers by His presence every home, and provides for the wants of every family, and watches every sick-bed, and listens to the complaints of every sufferer; and while, by His wondrous mind the weight of universal government is borne, oh! is it not more wondrous and more excellent still that He feels for every sorrow, and has an ear open to every prayer?

"It doth not yet appear what we shall be," says the apostle John, "but we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." It is the present lot of the angels, that they behold the face of our Father in heaven, and it would seem as if the effect of this was to form and to perpetuate in them the moral likeness of Himself, and that they reflect back upon Him His own image, and that thus a diffused resemblance to the Godhead is kept up amongst all those adoring worshippers who live in the near and rejoicing contemplation of the Godhead. Mark, then, how that peculiar and endearing feature in the goodness of the Deity, which we have just now adverted to—mark how beauteously it is reflected downwards upon us in the revealed attitude of angels. From the high eminences of heaven are they bending a wakeful regard over the men of this sinful world; and the repentance of every one of them spreads a joy and a high gratulation throughout all its dwelling-places. Put this trait of the angelic character into contrast with the dark and lowering spirit of an infidel. He is told of the multitude of other worlds, and he feels a kindling magnificence in the conception, and he is seduced by an elevation which he cannot carry, and from this airy summit does he look down on the insignificance of the world we occupy, and pronounces it to be unworthy of those visits and of those attentions which we read of in the New Testament. He is unable to wing his upward way along the scale, either of moral or of natural perfection; and when the wonderful extent of the field is made known to him, over which the wealth of the Divinity is lavished—there he stops, and wilders, and altogether misses this essential perception, that the power and perfection of the Divinity are not more displayed by the mere magnitude of the field than they are by that minute and exquisite filling up, which leaves not its smallest portions neglected; but which imprints the fulness of the Godhead upon every one of them; and proves, by every flower of the pathless desert, as well as by every orb of immensity, how this unsearchable Being can care for all, and provide for all, and, throned in mystery too high for us, can, throughout every instant of time, keep His attentive eye on every separate thing that He has formed, and by an act of His thoughtful and presiding intelligence, can constantly embrace all.

But God, compassed about as He is with light inaccessible, and full of glory, lies so hidden from the ken and conception of all our faculties, that the spirit of man sinks exhausted by its attempts to comprehend Him. Could the image of the Supreme be placed direct before the eye of the mind, that flood of splendour, which is ever issuing from Him on all who have the privilege of beholding, would not only dazzle, but overpower us. And therefore it is that I bid you look to the reflection of that image, and thus to take a view of its mitigated glories, and to gather the lineaments of the Godhead in the face of those righteous angels, who have never thrown away from them the resemblance in which they were created; and, unable as you are to support the grace and the majesty of that countenance, before which the sons and the prophets of other days fell, and became as dead men, let us, before we bring this argument to a close, borrow one lesson of Him who sitteth on the throne, from the aspect and the revealed doings of those who are surrounding it.

The infidel, then, as he widens the field of his contemplations, would suffer its every separate object to die away into forgetfulness: these angels, expatiating as they do over the range of a loftier universality, are represented as all awake to the history of each of its distinct and subordinate provinces. The infidel, with his mind afloat among suns and among systems, can find no place in his already occupied regards, for that humble planet which lodges and accommodates our species: the angels, standing on a loftier summit, and with a mightier prospect of creation before them, are yet represented as looking down on this single world, and attentively marking the every feeling and the every demand of all its families. The infidel, by sinking us down to an unnoticeable minuteness, would lose sight of our dwelling-place altogether, and spread a darkening shroud of oblivion over all the concerns and all the interests of men; but the angels will not so abandon us; and undazzled by the whole surpassing grandeur of that scenery which is around them, are they revealed as directing all the fulness of their regard to this our habitation, and casting a longing and a benignant eye on ourselves and on our children. The infidel will tell us of those worlds which roll afar, and the number of which outstrips the arithmetic of the human understanding—and then, with the hardness of an unfeeling calculation, will he consign the one we occupy, with all its guilty generations, to despair. But He who counts the number of the stars is set forth to us as looking at every inhabitant among the millions of our species.

and by the word of the Gospel beckoning to him with the hand of invitation, and, on the very first step of his return, as moving towards him with all the eagerness of the prodigal's father, to receive him back again into that presence from which he had wandered. And as to this world, in favour of which the scowling infidel will not permit one solitary movement, all heaven is represented as in a stir about its restoration; and there cannot a single son or a single daughter be recalled from sin unto righteousness without an acclamation of joy amongst the hosts of paradise. Ay, and I can say it of the humblest and the unworthiest of you all, that the eye of angels is upon him, and that his repentance would at this moment send forth a wave of delighted sensibility throughout the mighty throng of their innumerable legions.

Now, the single question I have to ask is, On which of the two sides of this contrast do we see most of the impress of heaven? Which of the two would be most glorifying to God? Which of them carries upon it most of that evidence which lies in its having a celestial character? For if it be the side of the infidel, then must all our hopes expire with the ratifying of that fatal sentence, by which the world is doomed, through its insignificancy, to perpetual exclusion from the attentions of the Godhead. I have long been knocking at the door of your understanding, and have tried to find an admittance to it for many an argument. I now make my appeal to the sensibilities of your heart; and, tell me, to whom does the moral feeling within it yield its readiest testimony—to the infidel, who would make this world of ours vanish away into abandonment—or to those angels who ring throughout all their mansions the hosannas of joy, over every one individual of its repentant population?

And here I cannot omit to take advantage of that opening with which our Saviour has furnished us by the parables of this chapter, and admits us into a familiar view of that principle on which the inhabitants of heaven are so awake to the deliverance and the restoration of our species. To illustrate the difference in the reach of knowledge and of affection between a man and an angel, let us think of the difference of reach between one man and another. You may often witness a man who feels neither tenderness nor care beyond the precincts of his own family; but who, on the strength of those instinctive fondnesses which nature has implanted in his bosom, may earn the character of an amiable father or a kind husband, or a bright example of all that is soft and endearing in the relations of domestic society. Now, conceive him, in addition to all this, to carry his affections abroad without, at the same time, any abatement of their intensity towards the objects which are at home—that, stepping across the limits of the house he occupies, he takes an interest in the families which are near him—that he lends his services to the town or the district wherein he is placed, and gives up a portion of his time to the thoughtful labours of a humane and public-spirited citizen. By this enlargement in the sphere of his attention he has extended his reach; and, provided he has not done so at the expense of that regard which is due to his family—a thing which, cramped and confined as we are, we are very apt, in the exercise of our humble faculties, to do—I put it to you, whether, by extending the reach of his views and his affections, he has not extended his worth and his moral respectability along with it?

But I can conceive a still further enlargement. I can figure to myself a man, whose wakeful sympathy overflows the field of his own immediate neighbourhood—to whom the name of country comes with all the omnipotence of a charm upon his heart, and with all the urgency of a most righteous and resistless claim upon his services—who never hears the name of Britain sounded in his ears, but it stirs up all his enthusiasm in behalf of the worth and the welfare of its people—who gives himself up, with all the devotedness of a passion, to the best and the purest objects of patriotism—and who, spurning away from him the vulgarities of party ambition, separates his life and his labours to the fine pursuit of augmenting the science, or the virtue, or the substantial prosperity of his nation. Oh! could such a man retain all the tenderness, and fulfil all the duties which home and which neighbourhood require of him, and at the same time expatiate, in the might of his untired faculties, on so wide a field of benevolent contemplation—would not this extension of reach place him still higher than before, on the scale both of moral and intellectual gradation, and give him a still brighter and more enduring name in the records of human excellence?

And lastly, I can conceive a still loftier flight of humanity—a man, the aspiring of whose heart for the good of man, knows no limitations—whose longings, and whose conceptions on this subject, overleap all the barriers of geography—who, looking on himself as a brother of the species, links every spare energy which belongs to him with the cause of its melioration—who can embrace within the grasp of his ample desires the whole family of mankind—and who, in obedience to a heaven-born movement of principle within him, separates himself to some big and busy enterprise, which is to tell on the moral destinies of the world. Oh! could such a man mix up the softenings of private virtue with the habit of so sublime a comprehension—if, amid those magnificent darings of thought and of performance, the mildness of his benignant eye could still continue to cheer the retreat of his family, and to spread the charm

and the sacredness of piety among all its members—could he even mingle himself, in all the gentleness of a soothed and a smiling heart, with the playfulness of his children—and also find strength to shed blessings of his presence and his counsel over the vicinity around him; oh! would not the combination of so much grace with so much loftiness, only serve the more to aggrandise him? Would not the one ingredient of a character so rare, go to illustrate and to magnify the other? And would not you pronounce him to be the fairest specimen of our nature, who could so call out all your tenderness, while he challenged and compelled all your veneration?

Nor can I proceed, at this point of my argument, without adverting to the way in which this last and this largest style of benevolence is exemplified in our own country—where the spirit of the Gospel has given to many of its enlightened disciples the impulse of such a philanthropy, as carries abroad their wishes and their endeavour to the very outskirts of human population—a philanthropy, of which, if you asked the extent or the boundary of its field, we should answer, in the language of inspiration, that the field is the world—a philanthropy which overlooks all the distinctions of caste and of colour, and spreads its ample regards over the whole brotherhood of the species—a philanthropy which attaches itself to man in the general; to man throughout all his varieties; to man as the partaker of one common nature, and who, in whatever clime or latitude you may meet with him, is found to breathe the same sympathies, and to possess the same high capabilities both of bliss and of improvement. It is true that, upon this subject, there is often a loose and unsettled magnificence of thought, which is fruitful of nothing but empty speculation. But the men to whom I allude have not imaged the enterprise in the form of a thing unknown. They have given it a local habitation. They have bodied it forth in deed and in accomplishment. They have turned the dream into a reality. In them, the power of a lofty generalisation meets with its happiest attemperment in the principle and preseverance, and all the chastening and subduing virtues of the New Testament. And, were I in search of that fine union of grace and of greatness which I have now been insisting on, and in virtue of which the enlightened Christian can at once find room in his bosom for the concerns of universal humanity, and for the play of kindliness towards every individual he meets with—I could nowhere more readily expect to find it, than with the worthies of our own land—the Howard of a former generation, who paced it over Europe in quest of the unseen wretchedness which abounds in it—or in such men of our present generation as Wilberforce, who lifted his unwearied voice against the biggest outrage ever practised on our nature, till he wrought its extermination—and Clarkson, who plied his assiduous task at rearing the materials of its impressive history, and at length carried, for this righteous cause, the mind of Parliament—and Carey, from whose hand the generations of the East are now receiving the elements of their moral renovation—and, in fine, those holy and devoted men, who count not their lives dear unto them; but, going forth every year from the island of our habitation, carry the message of Heaven over the face of the world; and in the front of severest obloquy are now labouring in remotest lands; and are reclaiming another and another portion from the wastes of dark and fallen humanity; and are widening the domains of Gospel light and Gospel principle amongst them; and are spreading a moral beauty around the every spot on which they pitch their lowly tabernacle; and are at length compelling even the eye and the testimony of gainsayers, by the success of their noble enterprise; and are forcing the exclamation of delighted surprise from the charmed and the arrested traveller, as he looks at the softening tints which they are now spreading over the wilderness, and as he hears the sound of the chapel bell, and as in those haunts where, at the distance of half a generation, savages would have scowled upon his path, he regales himself with the hum of missionary schools, and the lovely spectacle of peaceful and Christian villages.

Such, then, is the benevolence, at once so gentle and so lofty, of those men, who, sanctified by the faith that is in Jesus, have had their hearts visited from heaven by a beam of warmth and of sacredness. What, then, I should like to know, is the benevolence of the place from whence such an influence cometh? How wide is the compass of this virtue there, and how exquisite is the feeling of its tenderness, and how pure and how fervent are its aspirings among those unfallen beings who have no darkness, and no encumbering weight of corruption to strive against! Angels have a mightier reach of contemplation. Angels can look upon this world, and all which it inherits, as the part of a larger family. Angels were in the full exercise of their powers even at the first infancy of our species, and shared in the gratulations of that period, when at the birth of humanity all intelligent nature felt a gladdening impulse, and the morning stars sang together for joy. They loved us even with the love which a family on earth bears to a younger sister; and the very childhood of our tinier faculties did only serve the more to endear us to them; and though born at a later hour in the history of creation, did they regard us as heirs of the same destiny with themselves, to rise along with them in the scale of moral elevation, to bow at the same footstool, and to partake in those high dispensations of a

parent's kindness and a parent's care, which are ever emanating from the throne of the Eternal on all the members of a dutious and affectionate family. Take the reach of an angel's mind, but, at the same time, take the seraphic fervour of an angel's benevolence along with it; how, from the eminence on which he stands he may have an eye upon many worlds, and a remembrance upon the origin and the successive concerns of every one of them; how he may feel the full force of a most affecting relationship with the habitants of each, as the offspring of one common Father; and though it be both the effect and the evidence of our depravity, that we cannot sympathise with these pure and generous ardours of a celestial spirit; how it may consist with the lofty comprehension, and the ever-breathing love of an angel, that he can both shoot his benevolence abroad over a mighty expanse of planets and of systems, and lavish a flood of tenderness on each individual of their teeming population.

Keep all this in view, and you cannot fail to perceive how the principle, so finely and so copiously illustrated in this chapter, may be brought to meet the infidelity we have thus long been employed in combating. It was nature—and the experience of every bosom will affirm it—it was nature in the shepherd to leave the ninety and nine of his flock forgotten and alone in the wilderness, and betaking himself to the mountains, to give all his labour and all his concern to the pursuit of one solitary wanderer. It was nature; and we are told in the passage before us, that it is such a portion of nature as belongs not merely to men, but to angels; when the woman, with her mind in a state of listlessness as to the nine pieces of silver that were in secure custody, turned the whole force of her anxiety to the one piece which she had lost, and for which she had to light a candle, and to sweep the house, and to search diligently until she found it. It was nature in her to rejoice more over that piece, than over all the rest of them, and to tell it abroad among friends and neighbours, that they might rejoice along with her—ay, and sadly effaced as humanity is, in all her original lineaments, this is a part of our nature, the very movements of which are experienced in heaven, "where there is more joy over one sinner that repenteth, than over ninety and nine just persons who need no repentance." For anything I know, the every planet that rolls in the immensity around me may be a land of righteousness; and be a member of the household of God; and have her secure dwelling-place within that ample limit which embraces His great and universal family. But I know at least of one wanderer; and how woefully she has strayed from peace and from purity; and how in dreary alienation from Him who made her, she has bewildered herself amongst those many devious tracts, which have carried her afar from the path of immortality; and how sadly tarnished all those beauties and felicities are, which promised, on that morning of her existence when God looked on her, and saw that all was very good—which promised so richly to bless and to adorn her; and how, in the eye of the whole unfallen creation, she has renounced all this goodliness, and is fast departing away from them into guilt, and wretchedness, and shame. Oh! if there be any truth in this chapter, and any sweet or touching nature in the principle which runs throughout all its parables, let us cease to wonder, though they who surround the throne of love should be looking so intently towards us—or though, in the way by which they have singled us out, all the other orbs of space should, for one short season, on the scale of eternity, appear to be forgotten—or though, for every step of her recovery, and for every individual who is rendered back again to the fold from which he was separated, another and another message of triumph should be made to circulate amongst the hosts of paradise—or though, lost as we are, and sunk in depravity as we are, all the sympathies of heaven should now be awake on the enterprise of Him who has travailed, in the greatness of His strength, to seek and to save us.

And here I cannot but remark how fine a harmony there is between the law of sympathetic nature in heaven and the most touching exhibitions of it on the face of our world. When one of a numerous household droops under the power of disease, is not that the one to whom all the tenderness is turned, and who, in a manner, monopolises the inquiries of his neighbourhood, and the care of his family? When the sighing of the midnight storm sends a dismal foreboding into the mother's heart, to whom of all her offspring, I would ask, are her thoughts and her anxieties then wandering? Is it not to her sailor boy whom her fancy has placed amid the rude and angry surges of the ocean? Does not this, the hour of his apprehended danger, concentrate upon him the whole force of her wakeful meditations? And does not he engross, for a season, her every sensibility, and her every prayer? We sometimes hear of shipwrecked passengers thrown upon a barbarous shore; and seized upon by its prowling inhabitants; and hurried away through the tracks of a dreary and unknown wilderness; and sold into captivity; and loaded with the fetters of irrecoverable bondage; and who, stripped of every other liberty but the liberty of thought, feel even this to be another ingredient of wretchedness, for what can they think of but home, and as all its kind and tender imagery comes upon their remembrance, how can they think of it but in the bitterness of despair? Oh tell me, when the fame of all this disaster reaches his family, who is the member of it to whom is directed the full tide of its griefs and of its sympathies? Who is it that, for weeks and for months, usurps their every feeling, and calls out their largest sacri-

fices, and sets them to the busiest expedients for getting him back again? Who is it that makes them forgetful of themselves and of all around them; and tell me if you can assign a limit to the pains, and the exertions, and the surrenders which afflicted parents and weeping sisters would make to seek and to save him?

Now conceive, as we are warranted to do by the parables of this chapter, the principle of all these earthly exhibitions to be in full operation around the throne of God. Conceive the universe to be one secure and rejoicing family, and that this alienated world is the only strayed, or only captive member belonging to it; and we shall cease to wonder, that from the first period of the captivity of our species, down to the consummation of their history in time, there should be such a movement in heaven; or that angels should so often have sped their commissioned way on the errand of our recovery; or that the Son of God should have bowed Himself down to the burden of our mysterious atonement; or that the Spirit of God should now, by the busy variety of His all-powerful influences, be carrying forward that dispensatian of grace which is to make us meet for re-admittance into the mansions of the celestial. Only think of love as the reigning principle there; of love, as sending forth its energies and aspirations to the quarter where its object is most in danger of being for ever lost to it; of love, as called forth by this single circumstance to its uttermost exertion, and the most exquisite feeling of its tenderness; and then shall we come to a distinct and familiar explanation of this whole mystery. Nor shall we resist by our incredulity the Gospel message any longer, though it tells us that throughout the whole of this world's history, long in our eyes, but only a little month in the high periods of immortality, so much of the vigilance, and so much of the earnestness of heaven, should have been expended on the recovery of its guilty population.

There is another touching trait of nature, which goes finely to heighten this principle, and still more forcibly to demonstrate its application to our present argument. So long as the dying child of David was alive, he was kept on the stretch of anxiety and of suffering with regard to it. When it expired, he arose and comforted himself. This narrative of King David is in harmony with all that we experience of our own movements, and our own sensibilities. It is the power of uncertainty which gives them so active and so interesting a play in our bosoms; and which heightens all our regards to a tenfold pitch of feeling and of exercise; and which fixes down our watchfulness upon our infant's dying bed; and which keeps us so painfully alive to every turn and to every symptom in the progress of its malady; and which draws out all our affections for it to a degree of intensity that is quite unutterable; and which urges us on to ply our every effort and our every expedient, till hope withdraw its lingering beam, or till death shut the eyes of our beloved in the slumber of its long and its last repose.

I know not who of you have your names written in the book of life—nor can I tell if this be known to the angels which are in heaven. While in the land of living men, you are under the power and application of a remedy, which, if taken as the Gospel prescribes, will renovate the soul, and altogether prepare it for the bloom and the vigour of immortality. Wonder not then that with this principle of uncertainty in such full operation, ministers should feel for you; or angels should feel for you; or all the sensibilities of heaven should be awake upon the symptoms of your grace and reformation; or the eyes of those who stand upon the high eminences of the celestial world, should be so earnestly fixed on the every footstep and new evolution of your moral history. Such a consideration as this should do something more than silence the infidel objection. It should give a practical effect to the calls of repentance. How will it go to aggravate the whole guilt of our impenitency, should we stand out against the power and the tenderness of these manifold applications—the voice of a beseeching God upon us—the word of salvation at our very door—the free offer of strength and of acceptance sounded in our hearing—the Spirit in readiness with His agency to meet our every desire and our every inquiry—angels beckoning us to their company—and the very first movements of our awakened conscience drawing upon us all their regards and all their earnestness!

THE FLIGHT OF TIME.

Where are the men of the generation that is past? They, like ourselves, were eager in the pursuit of this world's phantoms, active in business, intent on the speculations of policy and state, led astray by the glitter of ambition, and devoted to the joys of sense or of sentiment. Where are the men who, a few years ago, gave motion and activity to this busy theatre? Where those husbandmen who lived on the ground that you now occupy? Where those labouring poor who dwelt in your houses and villages? Where those ministers who preached the lessons of piety and talked of the vanity of the world? Where those people who, on the Sabbaths of other times, assembled at the sound of the church bell, and filled the house, by the walls of which you are now congregated? Their habitation is the cold grave—the land of forgetfulness and silence. Their name is forgotten in the earth, their very children have lost the remembrance of them. The labours of their hands are covered with moss, or destroyed by the injuries of time. And we are the children of these fathers, and heirs to the same awful and stu-

pendous destiny. The time in which I live is but a small moment of this world's history. It is the flight of a shadow; it is a dream of vanity; it is the rapid glance of a meteor; it is a flower which every breath of heaven can wither into decay; it is a tale which as a remembrance vanishes; it is a day which the silence of a long night will darken and overshadow. In a few years our heads will be laid in the cold grave, and the green turf will cover us; the children who come after us will tread upon our graves; they will weep for us a few days; they will talk of us for a few months; they will remember us for a few years; then our memory shall disappear from the face of the earth, and not a tongue shall be found to recall it.

It strikes me as the most impressive of all sentiments that "it will be all the same a hundred years after this." It is often uttered in the form of a proverb, and with the levity of a mind that is not aware of its importance. A hundred years after this! Good heavens! with what speed and with what certainty will those hundred years come to their termination. This day will draw to a close, and a number of days make up a revolution of the seasons. Year follows year, and a number of years make up a century. These little intervals of time accumulate and fill up that mighty space which appears to the fancy so big and immeasurable. The hundred years will come, and they will see out the wreck of whole generations. Every living thing that now moves on the face of the earth will disappear from it. The infant that now hangs on its mother's bosom will only live in the remembrance of its grandchildren. The scene of life and of intelligence that is now before me will be changed into the dark and loathsome forms of corruption. The people who now hear me, they will cease to be spoken of; their memory will perish from the face of the country; their flesh will be devoured by worms; the dark and creeping things that live in the holes of the earth will feed upon their bodies; their coffins will have mouldered away, and their bones be thrown up in the new-made grave. And is this the consummation of all things? Is this the final end and issue of man? Is this the upshot of his busy history? Is there nothing beyond time and the grave to alleviate the gloomy picture, to chase away these dismal images? Must we sleep for ever in the dust, and bid an eternal adieu to the light of heaven?

LORD PALMERSTON.

1784-1865.

BRITISH FOREIGN POLICY, 1850.*

I BELIEVE I have now gone through all the heads of the charges which have been brought against me in this debate. I think I have shown that the foreign policy of the Government, in all the transactions with respect to which its conduct has been impugned, has throughout been guided by those principles which, according to the resolution of the honourable and learned gentleman, the member for Sheffield [Mr Roebuck], ought to regulate the conduct of the Government of England in the management of our foreign affairs. I believe that the principles on which we have acted are those which are held by the great mass of the people of this country. I am convinced these principles are calculated, so far as the influence of England may properly be exercised with respect to the destinies of other countries, to conduce to the maintenance of peace, to the advancement of civilisation, and to the welfare and happiness of mankind.

I do not complain of the conduct of those who have made these matters the means of attack upon her Majesty's ministers. The government of a great country like this is undoubtedly an object of fair and legitimate ambition to men of all shades of opinion. It is a noble thing to be allowed to guide the policy, and to influence the destinies of such a country, and if ever it was an object of honourable ambition, more than ever must it be so at the moment at which I am speaking. For while we have seen, as stated by the right honourable baronet, the member for Ripon [Sir James Graham], the political earthquake rocking Europe from side to side—while we have seen thrones shaken, shattered, levelled; institutions overthrown and destroyed—while, in almost every country of Europe, the conflict of civil war has deluged the land with blood, from the Atlantic to the Black Sea, from the Baltic to the Mediterranean; this country has presented a spectacle honourable to the people of England, and worthy of the admiration of mankind.

We have shown that liberty is compatible with order; that individual liberty is reconcilable with obedience to the law. We have shown the example of a nation, in which every class of society accepts with cheerfulness the lot which Providence has assigned to it; while at the same

* From a speech in the House of Commons on the affairs of Greece.

time every individual of each class is constantly striving to raise himself in the social scale—not by injustice and wrong, not by violence and illegality, but by persevering good conduct, and by the steady and energetic exertion of the moral and intellectual faculties with which his Creator has endowed him. To govern such a people as this is indeed an object worthy of the ambition of the noblest man who lives in the land; and, therefore, I find no fault with those who may think any opportunity a fair one for endeavouring to place themselves in so distinguished and honourable a position. But I contend that we have not in our foreign policy done anything to forfeit the confidence of the country. We may not, perhaps, in this matter or in that, have acted precisely up to the opinions of one person or of another—and hard indeed it is, as we all know by our individual and private experience, to find any number of men agreeing entirely in any matter, on which they may not be equally possessed of the details of the facts, and circumstances, and reasons, and conditions, which led them to action. But, making allowance for those differences of opinion which may fairly and honourably rise amongst those who concur in general views, I maintain that the principles which can be traced through all our foreign transactions, as the guiding rule and directing spirit of our proceedings, are such as deserve approbation. I therefore fearlessly challenge the verdict which this House, as representing a political, a commercial, a constitutional country, is to give on the question now brought before it; whether the principles on which the foreign policy of her Majesty's Government has been conducted, and the sense of duty which has led us to think ourselves bound to afford protection to our fellow-subjects abroad, are proper and fitting guides for those who are charged with the government of England; and whether, as the Roman, in days of old, held himself free from indignity; so also a British subject, in whatever land he may be, shall feel confident that the watchful eye and the strong arm of England will protect him against injustice and wrong.

SIR ROBERT PEEL.

1788-1850.

SPEECH AT TAMWORTH. JANUARY 11, 1835.

THERE never was an assumption more gratuitous and more arrogant than that of those who undertake to answer for the opinions, and to claim for themselves the authority, of the people of England. Every little knot of angry politicians speaks in the name of the people. They remind one of the story of Mr Sheridan—that three tailors met in Tooley Street, to petition Parliament, and headed their petition, "We, the people of England." They begin by excluding from their definition of the people the nobility, the clergy, the magistracy, the landed proprietary; they assume that, between those classes and the class which constitutes, in the sense of the term, the people, there is no community of interest or feeling, and that in the class so constituting the people there is perfect unanimity. Now, let them make what exclusions they please, can they make any which, with any semblance of decency, will exclude this society from its right to be considered a part of the people? I see around me magistrates, country gentlemen, the ministers of the Established Church, the ministers of Roman Catholic and Dissenting congregations, farmers, manufacturers, retail dealers—entertaining, no doubt, different opinions on many points, but agreed in this—to support the king in the exercise of his just prerogative, and at least to hear before they condemn the intentions of his Government. My belief is, that in holding this opinion they hold it in concurrence with a very large proportion of that class of society which has education, intelligence, and property, and that that proportion is daily increasing in numerical and moral strength.

I am told that I am not a reformer, and that if I become a reformer I must be an apostate. Now before I determine whether I am a reformer or not, I must have a definition of the term. I see some men who call themselves reformers, who throw the greatest obstructions in the way of real reform; who consume the public time in useless motions: who make speeches for mere display; who condemn everything as wrong, and set nothing right; who soar above the vulgar task of devising practical remedies themselves, and leave no time to others to devise them. They denounce you as a defender of all abuses, if you do not adopt their definition of an abuse. One gentleman thinks the Legislative Union an abuse; another thinks the Church of England an abuse; another thinks grand juries an abuse; another insists on vote by ballot; another on expelling the bishops from the House of Lords. I voted against all their propositions on these subjects, which were submitted to a vote; and, if this be the test of an anti-reformer and a patron of abuses, I must be

condemned as such—but I must be condemned in company with Lord Althorp and Lord John Russell, who voted as I did. I shall continue to take the same course; shall claim for myself the right to form my own judgment, neither taking for granted that that must be an abuse which any one may please to call an abuse, nor deterred from applying a remedy by the fear of being charged with apostasy. An apostate indeed! Why, I have done more in the cause of substantial and permanent improvement than nine-tenths of those who call themselves reformers. Who can justly charge me with the dereliction of any principle, supposing I do enforce economy, reduce unnecessary offices, facilitate commercial enterprise, or remove impediments from the course of justice? Did I lend a cold and lukewarm support to the alterations in our commercial policy? Was the Duke of Wellington's Government an enemy to retrenchment? Hear the testimony of an avowed and decided opponent of that Government, one of the late ministers—Lord Palmerston. In speaking at this very election to his constituents, after claiming that credit for economy for his own colleagues, to which, I must say, they were justly entitled, and mentioning the extent to which they had reduced expenditure and taxation, he adds, "This, it would be allowed, was doing a great deal in the way of reduction, considering that they had succeeded a government which, he would do it the justice to say, had laboured hard and efficiently in the work of economy and retrenchment."

Then as to the law, hear again the testimony of another of the late ministers, from whom I have differed in public life, but who did not withhold, on account of that difference, the honourable testimony of his applause to the course I pursued in respect to legal reform. In the year 1827, Sir John Hobhouse, then member for Westminster, made these observations in the House of Commons: "There was a practice which prevailed in the city which he had the honour to represent (Westminster), in obedience to which the representatives were obliged annually to appear before the represented, to render an account of their proceedings, and to receive such instructions with respect to their future conduct, as the circumstances of the times rendered expedient. Upon those occasions it had been usual to hold forth to their imitation *such men as were considered models with regard to conduct:* and he hoped it would be considered neither foolish nor improper to say, upon the present occasion, that *at those times the name of the right honourable gentleman had been always declared entitled to rank amongst those of the benefactors of mankind.*" [The Chancellor of the Exchequer here seemed to laugh.] "The chancellor," continued the right honourable gentleman, "may smile, but although there may be prejudices of another description, they looked only *on the great reformer of great abuses, and, as such, considered him entitled to the gratitude of the country.*"

Why do I refer to these things? Why do I appeal to the testimony thus given by competent and disinterested judges? For the purpose of showing that I can promote economy and correct acknowledged abuses, not only without a dereliction of principle, but in strict adherence to principle. My judgment of what constitutes an abuse may, and probably will, differ from that of many who require alterations in the law and institutions of this country. I may sometimes doubt whether that is abuse which is so designated. I may sometimes doubt whether the evil of the remedy is not greater than that of the disease. If I entertain that opinion, I will avow it, in spite of its temporary unpopularity; but I shall approach the consideration of an alleged abuse with a firm belief that, if the allegation be true, a government gains ten times more strength by correcting an admitted evil than they could by maintaining it, if it were possible to maintain it. I have interfered much too long with the proper object of this convivial meeting, and will bring my interruption to a close. [Loud cries of "No, no, go on, go on," here issued from every part of the room. The right honourable baronet then proceeded.]

Notwithstanding all the ominous predictions of our inability to carry on the government, I own to you that I do entertain the greatest confidence that those predictions will not be verified—and that the representatives of the country will not refuse to give to the king's ministers a FAIR TRIAL. A few weeks only can elapse before the experiment will be made. I am not alarmed at the lists that are published, dividing the Members of Parliament into "Conservatives" and "Reformers." I cannot but think that many of those who are classed as reformers entertain opinions not far different from my own; and every hour that passes will, I doubt not, increase the disposition to take a calmer view of the principles upon which we propose to act. If the public and the representatives of this country are convinced that we are desirous of maintaining our national institutions, and of improving them, with a view to their maintenance, I do not believe that they will lend themselves to any factious opposition to the king's Government. The people of England are anxious, I believe, to preserve, in their full integrity, the prerogatives of their ancient monarchy. They are anxious to maintain the free and independent action of every branch of the legislature; they are anxious to maintain the Church and its connection with the State, less for any civil or secular object than because they believe the maintenance of the Established Church to be the best security for the maintenance of that faith which they profess, and the surest bulwark against infidelity on the one hand, and fanaticism

on the other. They will support the Church on high grounds of religious feeling and principle, in which, even many, who do not conform to all the doctrines of the Church, may cordially and zealously concur. This object I, for one, am determined to maintain. But it is quite consistent with that object to relieve any real grievance, and to remove any civil disadvantage under which those who do not concur in the doctrines of the Established Church may labour. My opinion is that, with that course, coupled with a sincere desire to promote rational and well-matured improvement, the people of England will be content; nay more, that of that course they will cordially approve.

As for myself, whatever may be the result, I regard it without any feelings of anxiety or apprehension; I have no object of personal ambition to gratify, and, whatever else I may lose, I cannot lose the consolation of having acted on a sense of public duty at a period of great difficulty. * If I succeed, I shall have the satisfaction of thinking that I have succeeded against great obstacles and amid the most confident predictions of failure. I BELIEVE THAT I SHALL SUCCEED. I have that confidence in a good cause; I have that confidence in the success of good intentions; that I believe that a majority of the representatives of England will be satisfied with the measures which I shall propose, and that they will lend their support and co-operation in carrying them into effect. But, gentlemen, if I am mistaken; if, after having exerted myself to the utmost in that great cause in which I am engaged; if, having nothing to upbraid myself with, I shall nevertheless fail, then, I do assure you, so far as my personal feelings are concerned, I shall relinquish the powers, emoluments, and distinctions of office with any feelings rather than those of mortification and regret. I shall find ample compensation for the loss of office; I shall return to pursuits quite as congenial to my taste and feelings as the cares and labours of office; I shall feel the full force of the sentiments which are applied by the poet to the hardy natives of the Alpine regions:

> "As the loud torrent and the whirlwind's roar,
> But bind him to his native mountains more!"

so shall I feel, that the angry contentions and collisions of political life will but bind me the more to this place, not, indeed, the place of my nativity, but dearer to me than the place of my nativity—by every early recollection and association, and by the formation of those first friendships, which have remained uninterrupted to this hour. I shall return hither to do what good I can in a more limited sphere, and with humbler powers of action to encourage local improvement, to enjoy the opportunities of friendly intercourse, and to unite with you in promoting good fellowship, and a spirit of conciliation and mutual good-will in that society, to the bosom of which I shall return.

EDWARD IRVING.*

1792-1834.

SERVING GOD IN THE HOUSEHOLD.†

WHEN I look upon a family, of father, and mother, and flourishing children, with perhaps a goodly retinue of household servants, I say unto myself, What a work of Divine providence

---

* Many a sincere and worthy tribute has been paid to the life and work of Edward Irving from time to time. "Irving," says one, "almost alone among recent men, lived his sermons and preached his life. His words, more than those of any other modern speaker, were 'life passed through the fire of thought.'" *Blackwood's Magazine* has termed him the greatest preacher the world has seen since apostolic times; and Carlyle's lament over his death, in the form of a short article to *Fraser's Magazine* (1835), has always been admired for its pathos, sincerity, and truthfulness. We quote but a sentence or two:

"Closed are those lips. The large heart, with its large bounty, where wretchedness found solacement, and they that were wandering in darkness the light as of home, has paused. The strong man can no more: beaten on from without, undermined from within, he has had to sink overwearied, as at nightfall, when it was yet but the mid-season of day. Irving was forty-two years and some months old. Scotland sent him forth a Herculean man; our mad Babylon wore him and wasted him with all her engines, and it took her twelve years. He sleeps with his fathers in that loved birth-land. Babylon with its deafening inanity rages on, but to him henceforth innocuous, unheeded for ever. . . .

"What the Scottish uncelebrated Irving was, they that have only seen the London celebrated and distorted one can never know. Bodily and spiritually, perhaps there was not, in that November 1822, when he first arrived here, a man more full of genial energetic life in all these islands. . . .

"But for Irving I had never known what the communion of man with man means. His was the freest, brotherliest, bravest human soul mine ever came in contact with. I call him, on the whole, the best man I have ever, after trial enough, found in this world, or now hope to find."

† "And if it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord,

is here, what a signal manifestation of the goodness of God! Some ten or twenty years ago, there was nothing of this substance, none of these thriving children, nor did any of those happy domestics tend the many cares of this little state. Then those who rule it in nobler state than king or queen, whose smile is the joy, whose embrace is the highest ambition of the little ones, and upon whose nod the grown-up people wait with willing attendance;—this king and queen of the hearts of all (which that father and mother are not always, is their own wicked mismanagement, for God hath designed it, and hath provided it so to be) were some few years ago in subjection to their own parents, and most frequently without anything they could call their own. The one, like young Jacob, crossing the fords of Jordan to seek his inheritance, with a staff for all his portion ("With my staff I passed over this Jordan"); the other, like Rebekah, waiting on her father's flock, until it might please the Lord to send her a husband and to find her a home. These two the Lord brought together, with nothing but each other's love for their portion, perhaps without a home to dwell in, or a servant to minister to them. And from these two needy dependants of the Lord's providence all this little nation hath arisen. One immortal soul after another the Lord sent them, and with every hungry mouth He sent the food to satisfy its hunger. And in coming into existence, pain and trouble and death lay in wait for mother and child, but the Lord's arm sustained both. And often against the soft childhood of the little nursling death brought up various diseases, and shot his infectious arrows abroad amongst the children, but still the Lord sustained them. And while He blessed maternal carefulness at home, He blessed paternal carefulness abroad, finding them thousands and thousands of meals, so that they consumed not faster than He supplied;—the barrel never went empty, the cruse never ran dry, the wardrobe was ever full. And oft when that mother's heart was sick with sadness, and that father's arm weary in the rough encounter of the world, and ready to resign the oar which won his children's bread, the Lord sustained their hearts, and restored their souls. And here they are, brought by the Lord into a haven of rest, and their home is a little paradise of contentment, and perhaps there is a good store provided against the future, when their children shall have ripened into manhood, perhaps there are many attendants ministering in the house, perhaps many dependants abroad, and every comfort and every luxury which the present life can enjoy. Oh, when I look upon a family thus brought out of nothing, this miracle of the Divine providence and goodness, and haply sit with them cheerfully round the evening fire, and mingle in their enjoyment; it doth so delight my heart to hear them discourse of their family difficulties—to see the eye of a father brighten while he looks upon his present happiness, and the heart of a mother glad while she beholds her children opening into the liveliness and beauty of manhood! And if they intersperse their discourse with pious thankfulness to God, and devout acknowledgment of His goodness to them and theirs—if they teach their children to know the Lord God of their fathers, and to walk in His ways and to keep His precepts—if they, moreover, bow the knee in homage unto Him who feeds the raven, and clothes the lily of the field, and walk before Him in a perfect way at home; not only say with Joshua, but with Joshua perform, "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord;"—when this I behold, I say unto myself, Here is the happiest scene under heaven, the true seed-bed of greatness, the nursery of heaven. To this let the palace (as palaces are generally ordered), to this let the senate, to this let the academy, to this let the exchange, to this let every tabernacle under which worldly interests shelter, yield. Here is the abode of my soul—here will I rest, for I do like it well. But if it should otherwise happen that these two children of God's hand, for whom He hath builded a nest, and furnished it with plenty, and peopled it with dear children, and given it the children of others to do its servile work, forget all the doings of the Lord for them and theirs, and ascribe the glory unto themselves and unto Fortune (that usurper who hath nothing of his own), and boasteth that all the wealth of Providence is of his procuring;—oh, if I see this family estate, with no fear of God in the midst of them, consuming their meals with no thankfulness, rising in the morning with no prayer for counsel, and laying them down in the evening with no commendation of their spirits to God; if I hear His name passed amongst them like a household word, and His service slighted, and all the soul-cheering spirit of religion banished out of doors to dwell in the church or the cathedral,—oh, how I pity the children! They are rising for a prey to the enemy, who lieth in wait to take their souls after they have served him all the days of their life. Poor children! no one to care for their souls. Poor famished children! no spiritual food for you from the father and mother who bore you. The Lord preserve you, for your father and mother have forsaken you! The Saviour take you up, for surely ye are destitute! But for the parents—what ingrates are you! what a hardened and ungodly pair, thus to forget the Lord who found you solitary, and founded for you a habitation, and prospered

choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served, that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell; but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord" (Josh. xxiv 15).

you, and gave you children, the most valuable gift! Oh, it is pitiful to be in such a house, where everything is present but piety, which is the titular saint of all household graces. It seems to me a miracle that it should stand before the Lord. And I almost look for the moment when it will disperse like an illusion. But the Lord is long-suffering and spareth much. He wisheth all to come unto Him, therefore He is kind. Oh, then, revere Him in your houses, and return Him thanks for His great mercies, and you shall dwell safely and securely in the midst of those family infirmities which we now go on to declare as arguments for a godly establishment of the household.

When I look upon this family, and further think of its risks and dangers, its hopes and fears, and all its infirmity, I pity the more that it should be without the great patronage and protection of the Almighty Father of all. The life of the industrious father and of the careful mother hang by a thread, which a thousand accidents may cut asunder; and what then is to become of the little nest? To what serve the securities upon your lives—to what your houses and lands, which have no affections to cherish kindred affections, no bosom upon which the helpless infant may hang, nor lip to impart to the ear of listening childhood maternal counsel or paternal wisdom? And what are guardians, and what wealthy relations and friends, in the stead of parents in whom God has planted the rudiments of affection, and made their ministry as necessary for the rearing of a healthy soul, as for the rearing of a healthy body, in their offspring? Each child's life contained a thousand anxious affections and precious hopes, which by death are all scattered, as a fine elixir is when the frail vessel which held it falls to the earth. And if they ripen into manhood, how many pitfalls are in their path, and most alluring seductions, wherein being caught, the hearts of the parents are oft broken, and their grey hairs brought with sorrow to the grave! And contentious feuds in families do oft slay affection, and counteract nature, so that there shall be strokes instead of embraces, and frowns for smiles, and bitter wrath for melting love. And hoping the best, that death is escaped, and vice and passion fended off (although in the absence of religion I see not how), what foul winds may cross the course of the vessel in which this domestic state is embarked! Life is not a gay voyage upon the bosom of ample streams through luxuriant and beautiful fields, like that which kings and queens are reported to take at times through their ample territory; but it is a rough and traverse course amongst adverse currents and rough impediments, requiring each day a constant outlook, and ready activity of all concerned. Each post that arrives may bring to the father the heavy burden of a shipwrecked fortune, or to a mother the tidings of some scion of the house in foreign parts lopped off for ever from the parent stock. Each fair daughter, as she walks abroad, may catch the basilisk eye of some artful wretch; and each hopeful youth fall into the snares of some wicked woman, who lieth in wait for the unwary. Why should these things be hid from the thoughts of parents? Why should not all the infirmity of a family be laid open, that they may have their refuge in Jehovah's everlasting strength? Look upon this city where ye dwell. Behold the daughters of misery and vice. Was not each one of these a father's delight and a mother's joy, and the dwelling-place of as many natural affections and hopeful wishes as the daughter of a king? Each of these is a proof of a family's infirmity. And every youth who in fallen wretchedness paces these weary streets, and every haggard boy who looks into your face for charity, and the thousand striplings who prowl about and lie in wait for things not their own, having often upon their heads more capital offences than years, are all instances of domestic infirmity. And so are the lists of ruined merchants and broken traders, and the shipfuls of heavy-hearted emigrants from the various ports of this blessed island, and the large population of paupers which crowd the poorhouse, or depend upon the parish, and infinite cases more lamentable than those, which modestly hide their want, pining in secret over broken hopes and humbled fortunes, or haply relieved by the unseen hand of charity—these are all instances of that domestic infirmity with which I now desire to impress your mind, that ye may seek your strength in Him who "placeth the solitary in families, and maketh the children of the youth to be like arrows in the hand of a mighty man." There is refuge nowhere else against these infirmities, whether of the outward condition, or of the inward happiness of a family. In the outward infirmities, on which I insist the least, what refuge is there in the love of father or mother, or both, save in Him who is a father to the fatherless, and a husband to the widow, and the orphan's help? And in the ruin of our household wealth, what refuge save in the arms of His providence unto whom every creature openeth its mouth many times a day for nourishment, and findeth it either in the air or upon the earth, or in the waters under the earth? He alone can fill the house which is empty, and stock our exhausted barns, and make our presses to burst out with new wine. And when riches have taken unto themselves wings and flown away, like an eagle towards heaven, there are treasures on high, where neither moth nor rust corrupts, and where thieves break not through nor steal. But for the inward and spiritual infirmities against which it concerneth a family's weal to be defended—against the quarrels and animosities and jealousies of husband and wife—against

the misdirected affectionateness of parents towards children, which hath the sentence of God upon it, "He that spareth the rod hateth the child," and doth more than all other things fill the asylums with lunatics, and against the quarrels of children, and family feuds of every kind; what protecteth but the fear of God as the common head of the whole, which becometh like a centre towards which the wills of all do bend inwards, and from which they receive their directions outward? And what furnisheth the young men and young maidens against the temptations of the world, and especially of cities, which are as thickets limed by the fowler for the feet of youth? Ah! what can furnish their souls with that unfailing grace which shall preserve them from their own frailties in worldly desires, and so condition them around as that they shall grow up in the rough weather of life, and become patriarchs and matrons in their turn, and rear up a holy offspring to carry down the spiritual seed in their line till the end of time? Ah! where are those outward defences and inward supplies, save in the gift of God, who giveth liberally and upbraideth not? Whence are they but from the Spirit of God, who worketh in us to will and to do of God's good pleasure? Now, which of you would wish your children to be tossed to and fro on passion's wave, shipwrecked in some of the gulfs of hell, which are sensuality, worldliness, pride, cunning, ungodliness? Who of you would have his sons strong as the lion, and his daughters pure and innocent as the virgin before whom the lion croucheth? Who would live his honourable life over again in his honourable children, and see, like Abraham or Jacob, a long line of godly sons and pious daughters? Let that man plant the roof-tree of his house in holiness, and rear its walls in integrity; let him purify its threshold three times with prayer, and make the outgoings of the evenings and the mornings to rejoice together with a holy joy and mirth-making unto the Lord. Let him make his hearth holy as an altar; let him sanctify the inmost nook of his house with prayer; let his servants be of the seed of the godly, yea, the porter of his gate let him be a brother in Christ.

Now, I have no time for digressions, but I will have no man say to me that these things are Utopian. If he be a commoner who saith it, I will take him to the north and show him the reality of which I faintly sketch the picture. Our poet hath given it not amiss, because it was in his father's house; and, poor man! in his better days, when his father was gone, he, as the head of his father's house, fulfilled the holy office, which, had he continued faithfully and spiritually to perform, then at this day he would have been the first, yea, the very first, of Scotia's sons. For the holy fire still here and there shineth through the witch-light of genius. And it was the severe religion of his father which gave to his poetry that manly tone, and to his sentiment of love that holy tenderness which is the chief charm of his works. But I say he hath done it but faintly. For no man bred in towns can comprehend the nature of a Scottish peasant's prayer, and the martyr wildness of their psalmody. Except it be in the service-book of our sister Church, which is the gathered piety, not of one age or country, but of all ages and countries in Christendom,—except in that volume, there is nothing I have seen in print or heard in pulpits that cometh near to what I have heard in the smoky cottages of my native country. The prophetic wildness of their imagery, the spiritual richness of their diction, the large utterance of their soul, the length, the strength, and the fervour of their prayers, is a thing to be talked of by the natives of the towns, in which religion seemeth to me oft a kind of marketable commodity. And it is a thing to make pastors and bishops look to their gifts, as truly it did amaze two of the most spiritually-gifted and learned of bishops, the pious Leighton and the learned Burnet. Let no man talk, therefore, of these speculations as Utopian, but go and see, go and learn, go and do likewise.

And if the man who chargeth Utopianism upon these institutions be a great one—a peer or noble of the realm—I tell him it is a shame, a crying shame, a sin that smelleth rank in the land, and reacheth even to heaven, the way in which these spacious households are ordered, men-servants and maid-servants, man and child, noblemen and noblewomen, and the hopes of noble houses, without morning or evening prayer, or any spiritual exhortation; all the day long huddled together in horrid moral and spiritual confusion—week-day and Sabbath-day spent nearly alike—lying a necessary accomplishment in servants, unseemly hours, meetings at midnight, and housefuls of people commencing the night in hot and crowded places, till the sun ashamed looketh upon such doings of immortal men. In the name of Heaven, what piety, what virtue, what manhood, what common sense, or meaning, can stand such customs? They would corrupt an anchorite, and a saint would rise and run like Joseph from the temptation. I think an angel or an archangel could hardly endure it. Can any pious prayer co-exist, any melody unto the Lord, any jubilee or merry-making of the Spirit, with such disjointed living? Can repentance, can meditation, can reflection, or any mood of mind which consisteth with God, or savoureth of nobleness, live in such a vain show and idle rout? But there have been noble families otherwise ordered, both in this and the other end of the island; and happily there are some still, wherein chaplains were kept for use and not for show—learned men, and men who

feared God, not men who hung on for a scrap of patronage, but men who stood for the Lord, and for the spirit of holiness in the family—to offer up its prayers, to counsel the heads of the house, to instruct the children, to teach the servants their duties in a religious sense, to gather the whole household together and exhort them all—one who was a minister of God amongst them, and showed his gifts in watching over the souls of a household, thereby manifesting his worthiness to be translated to a parochial or a diocesan cure. The Protestant religion made its way through the noble families of the north. Knox first preached the doctrines of the Reformed religion in a nobleman's hall; and there he first administered the sacrament of the Supper in that simple form which soon laid low the vain and wicked foolery of the mass.

So that the idea which I represented of a godly family is far from being Utopian in high or in low life. Nothing is Utopian for which God hath given forth His rescript; and in this way He hath ordered houses to be trained up, adding His promise, that when they are old they will not depart from it. But while the world lasts, fashion will whirl it about, and luxury intoxicate it, and passion drive it headlong. Let the world go; let it go its wicked round to its miserable end. But ye are not of the world who have come up to serve Him this day in His courts; or if ye be, come out from them and be saved. Who is upon the Lord's side? Who? Let that man look better to his children than the world doth to its flocks and its herds. Let him look to the holiness of his home more than they do to the profits of their business room. Oh, let him look to the righteous standing of his children with God, more than they do to their right standing with great men and their prospects in life. Then shall the infirmity of his family be cured, and in weakness it shall be strong, and in poverty rich, and in the darkest hidings of the world's countenance it shall be glad. In its afflictions it shall be comforted, in its sicknesses healed, in its bereavements blessed, and in everything made superior to the vexations of life and the troubles of time.

I look upon a family, and think of its dissolution—how it shall disappear before the touch of death like the frost-work of a winter morning, and all its strong attachments dissolve like the breaking-up of the ice-bound waters at the approach of spring—how snowy age, and tottering feebleness, and stark death, shall at length come upon the stately supporters of the domestic state, and they shall fall into the grave, bearing with them the thousand loves and affections which can find no second stem to which to transplant themselves. And then comes strong grief for an honest and wise father, and the sad apparel and pale countenance of widowhood and fatherless children, who know not where to look for bread or for patronage. And a mother hath the right over her children shared by some relative or friend, who supplieth the evening and morning consultations of parents over their offspring. And oft the children, like encumbrances, are got rid of to the earliest employment, without any study of their natural disposition or turn of mind, and sent into a cold fatherless world to make the best of it. And perhaps also, ere this, a mother is reft away in her tenderness from the midst of her babes and immature children, who go about the cold house, and cry for her that bore them; but she is not to be found, neither answereth to their cries. And now cometh orphanage, fatherless and motherless orphanage. A stranger comes to nurse the babe, and the babe is happy in its unconsciousness of its loss; but the little ones know not the voice of the stranger. Then asylums are sought for some, and charitable foundations for others, where, far from the chamber of home, their hearts winnowed of their natural loves, they grow as upon a rock, hardy but stunted, strong but crooked and twisted in their growth, for want of the natural soil and genial atmosphere of a father's and a mother's love. And if it is ordered otherwise, that the children should be plucked away in their youth or in their prime, and the two parents left, naked and solitary, without a scion from their roots, or any fruit upon their boughs; then they go all their days mourning; the joy of their life is cut off in the mid-time of their days, their best hopes and dearest affections are buried in the dust. But in whatever way the king of terrors maketh his approach, and in whatever order he taketh away his victims, certain it is that he will not cease until he hath taken them all. He will leave none to tell unto future ages the domestic tale of sufferings and death. One by one they shall be plucked away; after intervals of days, or months, or years, he shall come again, and a mother's tears and a father's repressed and silent sorrow, yet too big for his manly breast to contain, and fond children, and the tender years of his victim—nothing shall withhold his arm, or ward off the blow. Time after time he shall come, and fill the hearts of all with sorrow, and clothe their countenances with sadness, and deluge their couch with tears, and fill the house with lamentations, until, one by one, he hath gotten them in his hold, and all the affection that smiled and prattled, all the happiness that glowed around the fire, and all the festivity of birthday and bridal-day that gladdoned the halls of that house, are now converted into the dampness and darkness and unsightliness of the family vault, where father and mother, and children, and children's children, with all their beauty and strength, lie a heap of unsavoury earth. And perhaps the mansion where they were reared is roofless and tenantless, and the garden where they took their pleasure overrun with weeds; and if some descendant come from

foreign parts to visit the place of which his father spoke so much, haply he hardly findeth its ruins, or discovereth the spot which once glowed beneath the fires of the patriarchal hearth. "Our fathers, where are they? The prophets, do they live for ever?" Is not our life like a vapour, and the days of our years like a tale that is told?

Now, I know not how a family without the comforts of religion, and the hopes of reunion in heaven, can see its way through this succession of terrible afflictions which must come, wave upon wave, until they be all washed away from the shores of time; how they can join affections in this uncertainty of their abiding; how they can knit them in this certainty of their being reft asunder; how they can thus sleep and take their rest; how they can thus rejoice together and make happy, while the terrors of death are around them, and the dark skirts of eternity are shifting from place to place in their neighbourhood, ever hovering more and more near, and, now and then, enfolding one and another in its dark bosom. And what comfort, what shadow of consolation, remaineth to a death-invaded family, to which there is no hope beyond death and the grave? The Catholics have a provision for this in the deceitful doctrine of purgatory; but we Protestants have none. Ours is a remorseless religion to the irreligious; no bowels of compassion can move it from its awful truth, no tears of a tender wife or grief-distracted mother can win one compromising word. As sure as it is written, "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth, yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours, and their works do follow them," so surely it is written, "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him;" "Depart from me, ye workers of iniquity, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Why should these things be hidden, and men left in their lethargy and sleep till the awakening of the last trump?

As sure as father and mother, and stately sons and beautiful daughters, do now live in the bower of family blessings, so sure shall father and mother, and stately sons and beautiful daughters, be taken, one after another, into the grave of all blessing, and the house of all cursing, unless they seek the Lord while He is to be found, and call upon Him while He is near. And as strong as your affection now is to one another, so strong shall your grief, your inconsolable grief be, when one and another and another are taken away, until at length one is left, like Rachel, weeping for the rest, whose bosom hath received all the wounds, and hath been doomed to live and behold all the arrows of the Lord accomplish their unerring aim. And what comfort is there, I ask you, but such as cometh from eternity and immortality? Do you say, Time heals every wound? Ay, time heals the wounds of time by slaying eternity. He vampeth up a kind of endurance of threescore and ten years by the death of ages and ages. That is the cure of time. Do you say, the shifting scenery of the world wears the impression out? Then again the visible pleaseth us by obscuring the invisible—the ups and downs of life and its goings to and fro whirl the brain out of its musings and contemplations—and that is comfort. So a mother comforts her baby with a toy, and wiles it out of the memory of what it hath lost by a gaudy thing given it to look at or to handle. And what kind of affection is that which gaieties and diversions can obliterate? and what affection is that which looks for its remedy in the oblivion of a few years? It is of the very essence of affection that it should last and last for ever. The soul knows no death in its feelings except the death brought on by vice, and the world, and unspiritual desires. And that affection which in its sense and touch looks for the remedy of change or of oblivion contains its own power and its own death within itself; and though it open itself fair and full as the opening rose, there is a serpent under it to sting him that layeth hold thereon; and there is a canker-worm in the heart to consume itself. Affection thinks not of dissolution; if it be true affection, it thinks only of everlasting, of lasting for ever. And such are the affections of nature; they knit themselves for everlasting, and they grow up for everlasting, and they are arguments of an everlasting life, and death cometh upon them in their prime, and beareth them away like lovers on their bridal day. Oh, then, what is a family full of affection, which have no hopes of eternity! It is like a nest of callow young seized upon by the kite ere yet they have known to float over the azure heaven in that free liberty for which nature was feathering their little frames.

But when the family is impressed with the spirit of holiness, then affection opens itself without any fear of untimely dissolution, and grows up for eternity, and hath therein the gratification of its proper nature. For as it is the nature of the understanding to conceive all things under the conditions of time and place, it seems to be the nature of the affections to forget these conditions, and to act under the opposite conditions of eternity and omnipresence. They seem to defy time, and to unite as it were for ever; they are regardless of place, consume the intervening distance, dwell with their object, and rejoice over it. The contemplation of change by place or time is the death of affection—it lives for all places and for all duration, and cannot abide the thought of dissolution; nor is it ever dissolved, as hath been said, save by the withering hand of vice and worldliness. Therefore without hope of everlasting, affection is miserable; and if I had time, I could show that it enjoys itself only by a kind

of illusion that it is to be everlasting, from which, alas! it is awakened by the bereavements of death. But with hope of immortality, affection is in its element, and flourisheth beautifully. And the family state being a web of interlacing affection, religion is its very life; and in proportion as it is present, the affections wax warmer and warmer, purer and purer, more and more spiritual, less and less dependent upon adversity or affliction or death. And when so rooted and grounded in Divine love, and glorious hope of immortality, a family is fenced against evil, and made triumphant over death. Life is but its cradle, and the actions of life are its childhood, and eternity is its maturity.

EXTRACTS.

GOD'S GOODNESS TO MAN.

He presents Himself as our Father, who first breathed into our nostrils the breath of life, and ever since hath nourished and brought us up as children—who prepared the earth for our habitation, and for our sakes made its womb to teem with food, with beauty, and with life. For our sakes no less He garnished the heavens, and created the whole host of them with the breath of His mouth, bringing the sun forth from his chamber every morning with the joy of a bridegroom and a giant's strength, to shed his cheerful light over the face of creation, and draw blooming life from the cold bosom of the ground —from Him also was derived the wonderful workmanship of our frames—the eye, in whose small orb of beauty is pencilled the whole of heaven and of earth, for the mind to peruse and know, and possess, and rejoice over even as if the whole universe were her own—the ear, in whose vocal chambers are entertained harmonious numbers, the melody of rejoicing nature, the welcomes and salutations of friends, the whispering of love, the voices of parents and of children, with all the sweetness that resideth in the tongue of man. His also is the gift of the beating heart, flooding all the hidden recesses of the human frame with the tide of life—His the cunning of the hand, whose workmanship turns rude and raw materials to pleasant forms and wholesome uses—His the whole vital frame of man, is a world of wonders within itself, a world of bounty, and, if rightly used, a world of finest enjoyments. His also the mysteries of the soul within—the judgment which weighs in a balance all contending thoughts, extracting wisdom out of folly, and extricating order out of confusion; the memory, recorder of the soul, in whose books are chronicled the accidents of the changing world, and the fluctuating moods of the mind itself; fancy, the eye of the soul, which scales the heavens and circles round the verge and circuits of all possible existence; hope, the purveyor of happiness, which peoples the hidden future with brighter forms and happier accidents than ever possessed the present, offering to the soul, the foretaste of every joy; affection, the nurse of joy, whose full bosom can cherish a thousand objects without being impoverished, but rather replenished, a storehouse inexhaustible towards the brotherhood and sisterhood of this earth, as the storehouse of God is inexhaustible to the universal world; finally, conscience, the arbitrator of the soul and the touchstone of the evil and the good, whose voice within our breast is the echo of the voice of God. These, all these—whose varied actions and movement constitutes the maze of thought, the mystery of life, the continuous chain of being—God hath given us to know that we hold of His hand, and during His pleasure, and out of the fulness of His care.

Upon which tokens of His affectionate bounty, not upon bare authority, command and fear, God desireth to form a union, and intimacy with the human soul; as we love our parents from whom we derived our being, sustenance, and protection while we stood in need, and afterwards proof of unchanging and undying love, so God would have us love Him in whom we live and move, and breathe, and have our being, and from whom proceedeth every good and perfect gift; and as out of this strong affection, we not only obey, but honour the commandments of our father and mother, so willeth He that we should honour and obey the commandments of our Father in heaven. As we look up to a master in whose house we dwell, and at whose plentiful board we feed—with whose smiles we are recreated, and whose service is gentle and sweet—so God wisheth us to look up to Him, in whose replenished house of nature He hath given us a habitation, and from whose bountiful table of providence we have a plentiful living, and whose service is full of virtue, health, and joy. As we love a friend who took us by the hand in youth, and helped us step by step up the hill of life, and found for our feet a room to rest in, and for our hands an occupation to work at, so God wisheth to be loved for having taken us up from the womb, and compassed us from our childhood, and found us favour in the sight of men—as we revere a master of wisdom, who nursed our opening mind, and fed it with knowledge and with prudence, until the way of truth and peacefulness lay disclosed before us, so God wisheth to be revered for giving to our souls all the faculties of knowledge, and to nature all the hidden truths which these faculties reveal. In truth, there is not an excellent attachment, by which the sons of men are bound together, which doth not bind us more strongly to God, and lay the foundation of all generous and noble sentiments towards Him within the mind—of all loving, dutiful, reverential conduct towards Him in our outward walk and conversation.

THE CREATION OF MAN.

It is said that God created man of the dust of the earth, and that He formed Eve of a rib from Adam's side. This, as it stands, is a sublime lesson of God's power, and our humble origin, and of the common incorporate nature of man and woman; but if you go to task your powers of comprehension, you are punished for your presumption by the arid scepticism and barrenness of heart which comes over you. Make man of dust? we soliloquise. How is that? Of dust, we can make the mould, or form of man; but what is baked clay to living flesh and conscious spirit? Make it in one day? these thousand fibres, more delicate than the gossamer's thread —these thousand vessels, more fine than the discernment of the finest instrument of vision—these bones balanced and knit, and compacted so strongly—these muscles—with their thousand combinations of movement—this secret organisation of brain, the seat of thought—the eye, the ear, the every sense, all constructed out of earth, and in one day. This stately form of manhood, which requires generation and slow conception, and the milky juices of the mother, and ten thousand meals of food, and the exercise of infinite thought and actions, long years of days and nights, the one to practise and train, the other to rest and refresh the frame before it can come to any maturity—this to be created in one day, out of primitive dust of the ground! Impossible! Unintelligible! And if we go further into the thing, and meditate that, seeing there was no second act of God, this creation out of dust was not of one man, and one woman, but of all men and all women that have ever been, and are to be for ever! that it was virtually the peopling of all nations and kingdoms of the earth, in one day out of inanimate dust—who can fathom the work? It is inconceivable, idle, and not worthy a thought. Thus the mind becomes the dupe of its own inquisitiveness, and loseth all the benefit of this revelation.

THE BIBLE NEGLECTED.

Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth! I came from the love and embrace of God; and mute nature, to whom I brought no boon, did me rightful homage. To man I came, and my words were to the children of men. I disclosed to you the mysteries of hereafter, and the secrets of the throne of God. I set open to you the gates of salvation, and the way of eternal life heretofore unknown. Nothing in heaven did I withhold from your hope and ambition; and upon your earthly lot I poured the full horn of Divine providence and consolation. But ye requited me with no welcome, ye held no festivity on my arrival! Ye sequester me from happiness and heroism, closeting me with sickness and infirmity; ye make not of me, nor use me for your guide to wisdom and prudence, but press me into your list of duties, and withdraw me to a mere corner of your time; and most of ye set me at naught, and utterly disregard me. I came the fulness of the knowledge of God: angels delighted in my company, and desired to dive into my secrets. But ye mortals place masters over me, subjecting me to the discipline and dogmatism of men, and tutoring me in your schools of learning. I came not to be silent in your dwellings, but to speak welfare to you and to your children. I came to rule, and my throne to set up in the hearts of men. Mine ancient residence was the bosom of God; no residence will I have but the soul of an immortal; and if you had entertained me, I should have possessed you of the peace which I had with God, "when I was with Him and was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him." "Because I have called and you refused, I have stretched out my hand and no man regarded; but ye have set at naught all my counsel, and would none of my reproof; I also will laugh at your calamity, and mock when your fear cometh; when your fear cometh as desolation, and your destruction cometh as a whirlwind; when distress and anguish cometh upon you. Then shall they cry unto me, but I will not answer; they shall seek me early, but they shall not find me."

THE PRESS AND THE PULPIT.

The press hath come to master the pulpit in its power; and to be able to write powerful books, seems to me a greater accomplishment of a soldier of Christ, than to be able to preach powerful discourses. The one is a dart which, though well directed, may fly wide of the mark, and having once spent its strength, is useless for ever; the other is the ancient catapulta, which will discharge you a thousand darts at once, in a thousand different directions; and it hath an apparatus for making more darts, so that it can continue to discharge them for ever. To use this most powerful of intellectual and moral instruments in the service of Christ is a noble ambition, which should possess the soul of every Christian.

EMBLEMS OF HEAVEN.

If emblems can assist you, then do you join in your imagination the emblems and pictures of heaven. What is the condition of its people? That of crowned kings. What is their enjoyment? That of conquerors triumphant, with palms of victory in their hands. What their haunts? The green pastures by the living waters. What their employment? Losing their spirits in the ecstasies of melody, making music upon their harps to the Lord God Almighty, and to the Lamb for ever and ever. For guidance? The Lamb that is in the midst of them shall lead them by rivers of living waters, and wipe away all tears from their eyes. For knowledge? They shall be like unto God, for they

shall know even as they are known. For vision and understanding? They shall see face to face, needing no intervention of language or of sign. The building of the wall is of jasper, the city of pure gold like unto clear glass, the foundation of the wall garnished with all manner of precious stones, every one of the twelve gates a pearl. Now what means this wealth of imagery drawn from every storehouse of nature, if it be not that the choicest of all which the eye beholds or the head is ravished with — that all which makes matter beautiful and the spirit happy—that all which wealth values itself on and beauty delights in, with all the scenery which charms the taste, and all the enjoyments which can engage the affections; everything, in short, shall lend its influence to consummate the felicity of the saints in light.

Oh, what untried forms of happy being, what cycles of revealing bliss, await the just! Conception cannot reach it, nor experience present materials for the picture of its similitude; and though thus figured out by the choicest emblems, they do no more represent it than the name of Shepherd doth the guardianship of Christ, or the name of Father the love of Almighty God.

GOD CAN CREATE ANOTHER WORLD FAIRER THAN THIS.

Of how many cheap, exquisite joys, are these five senses the inlets? and who is he that can look upon the beautiful scenes of the morning, lying in the freshness of the dew, and the joyful light of the risen sun, and not be happy? Cannot God create another world many times more fair? and cast over it a mantle of light many times more lovely? and wash it with purer dew than ever dropped from the eyelids of the morning? Can He not shut up winter in his hoary caverns, or send him howling over another domain? Can He not form the crystal eye more full of sweet sensations, and fill the soul with a richer faculty of conversing with nature than the most gifted poet did ever possess? Think you the creative function of God is exhausted upon this dark and troublous ball of earth? or that this body and soul of human nature are the masterpiece of His architecture?

THE GROWING CHARACTER OF A SERVANT OF GOD.

It cannot otherwise happen, than that a mind constantly accustomed to behold, and constantly training itself to practise whatever is noble and good, must grow greatly in its own esteem, and advance likewise in the estimation of the wise and good, and rise into influence over the better part of men; so that there will attend upon the goings of the servant of God, a light which shineth more and more unto the perfect day; a harmony of motion pleasant to all beholders, and a liberty of action delightful to himself. There will also grow within his soul a unison of faculties through the tuition of the law of God — impetuous passions being tamed, irregular affections being guided in their proper courses, the understanding being fed from the fountain of truth, hope looking to revelations that shall never be removed, and will being subordinate to the good pleasure of God. Like a busy state in which there is no jarring of parties, but one heart and one soul through all its people; like the body when every member doth its office, and the streams of life flow unimpeded, the soul thus pacified from inward contention, and fed with the river of God's pleasure, enjoys a health and strength, a peace which passeth all understanding, and a joy which the world can neither give nor take away.

KNOWLEDGE AND LIBERALITY OF MIND.

You may keep a few devotees together by the hereditary reverence of ecclesiastical canons, and influence of ecclesiastical persons; but the thinking and influential minds must be overcome by showing, that not only can we meet the adversary in the field by force of argument, but that the spirit of our system is ennobling and consoling to human nature—necessary to the right enjoyment of life, and conducive to every good and honourable work. Religion is not now to be propagated by rebuking the free scope of thought, and drafting as it were every weak creature that will abase his powers of mind before the zeal and unction of a preacher, and by schooling the host of weaklings to keep close and apart from the rest of the world. This both begins wrong and ends wrong. It begins wrong, by converting only a part of the mind to the Lord, and holding the rest in superstitious bonds. It ends wrong, in not sending your man forth to combat in his courses with the unconverted. The reason of both errors is one and the same. Not having thoroughly furnished him to render a reason of the hope that is in him, you dare not trust him in the enemy's camp, lest they should bring him over again, or laugh at him for cleaving to a side which he cannot thoroughly defend. I mean not in this, and the many other allusions which I have made to the degeneracy of our times, to argue that every Christian should be trained in schools of learning or human wisdom, but that the spirit of our procedure in making and keeping proselytes should be enlightened and liberal, and the character of our preaching strong and manly as well as sound. That we should rejoice in the illumination of the age, and the cultivation of the public mind, as giving us a higher tribunal than hath perhaps ever existed, before which to plead the oracles of God—before which to come in all the strength and loveliness of our cause, asking a verdict, not from their toleration of us its advocates, but upon their conscience, and from the demonstration of its truth.

THOMAS CARLYLE.*

1795–1881.

ADDRESS TO THE STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.†

GENTLEMEN,—I have accepted the office you have elected me to, and have now the duty to return thanks for the great honour done me. Your enthusiasm towards me, I admit, is very beautiful in itself, however undesirable it may be in regard to the object of it. It is a feeling honourable to all men, and one well known to myself when I was in a position analogous to your own. I can only hope that it may endure to the end—that noble desire to honour those whom you think worthy of honour, and come to be more and more select and discriminate in the choice of the object of it; for I can well understand that you will modify your opinions of me and many things else as you go on. There are now fifty-six years gone last November since I first entered your city, a boy of not quite fourteen—fifty-six years ago—to attend classes here, and gain knowledge of all kinds, I know not what, with feelings of wonder and awe-struck expectation; and now, after a long, long course, this is what we have come to. There is something touching and tragic, and yet at the same time beautiful, to see the third generation, as it were, of my dear old native land, rising up and saying, "Well, you are not altogether an unworthy labourer in the vineyard: you have toiled through a great variety of fortunes, and have had many judges." As the old proverb says, "He that builds by the wayside has many masters." We must expect a variety of judges; but the voice of young Scotland, through you, is really of some value to me, and I return you many thanks for it, though I cannot describe my emotions to you, and perhaps they will be much more conceivable if expressed in silence.

When this office was proposed to me, some of you know that I was not very ambitious to accept it, at first. I was taught to believe that there were more or less certain important duties which would lie in my power. This, I confess, was my chief motive in going into it—at least, in reconciling the objections felt to such things; for if I can do anything to honour you and my dear old *Alma Mater*, why should I not do so? Well, but on practically looking into the matter when the office actually came into my hands, I find it grows more and more uncertain and abstruse to me whether there is much real duty that I can do at all. I live four hundred miles away from you, in an entirely different state of things; and my weak health—now for many years accumulating upon me—and a total unacquaintance with such subjects as concern your affairs here—all this fills me with apprehension that there is really nothing worth the least consideration that I can do on that score. You may, however, depend upon it, that if any such duty does arise in any form, I will use my most

* In "Portraits of Public Characters," published in 1841, we have a description of Carlyle's appearance as a public lecturer. "When he enters the room, and proceeds to the sort of rostrum whence he delivers his lectures, he is, according to the usual practice in such cases, generally received with applause; but he very rarely takes any more notice of the mark of approbation thus bestowed upon him than if he were altogether unconscious of it. And the same seeming want of respect for his audience, or at any rate the same disregard for what I believe he considers the troublesome forms of politeness, is visible at the commencement of his lecture. Having ascended his desk, he gives a hearty rub to his hands, and plunges at once into his subject. He reads very closely, which, indeed, must be expected, considering the nature of the topics which he undertakes to discuss. He is not prodigal of gesture with his arms or body; but there is something in his eye and countenance which indicates great earnestness of purpose, and the most intense interest in his subject. You can almost fancy, in some of his more enthusiastic and energetic moments, that you see his inmost soul in his face."

Harriet Martineau, in her "Autobiography," gives a similar account of Carlyle's appearance before a London audience, which may prove a supplement to the above, and which is as matter of fact as it can be. "It was our doing—that friend's and mine—that he gave lectures for three or four seasons. He had matter to utter; and there were many who wished to hear him; and in those days, before his works had reached their remunerative point of sale, the earnings by his lectures could not be unacceptable. So we confidently proceeded, taking the management of the arrangements, and leaving Carlyle nothing to do but to meet his audience, and say what he had to say. Whenever I went, my pleasure was spoiled by his unconcealed nervousness. Yellow as a guinea, with downcast eyes, broken speech at the beginning, and fingers which nervously picked at the desk before him, he could not for a moment be supposed to enjoy his own effort; and the lecturer's own enjoyment is a prime element of success. The merits of Carlyle's discourses were, however, so great that he might probably have gone on year after year till this time (1832-34), with improving success, and perhaps ease; but the struggle was too severe. From the time that his course was announced till it was finished, he scarcely slept, and he grew more dyspeptic and nervous every day, and we were at length entreated to say no more about his lecturing, as no fame and no money or other advantage could counterbalance the misery which the engagement caused him."

† Delivered in the Music Hall, Edinburgh, April 2, 1866. For a full descriptive account of the delivery of this speech, which was so successfully accomplished, see "The English Essayists," p. 478

faithful endeavour to do whatever is right and proper, according to the best of my judgment.

In the meanwhile, the duty I have at present —which might be very pleasant, but which is quite the reverse, as you may fancy—is to address some words to you on some subjects more or less cognate to the pursuits you are engaged in. In fact, I had meant to throw out some loose observations—loose in point of order, I mean—in such a way as they may occur to me —the truths I have in me about the business you are engaged in, the race you have started on, what kind of race it is you young gentlemen have begun, and what sort of arena you are likely to find in this world. I ought, I believe, according to custom, to have written all that down on paper, and had it read out. That would have been much handier for me at the present moment, but when I attempted to write, I found that I was not accustomed to write speeches, and that I did not get on very well. So I flung that away, and resolved to trust to the inspiration of the moment—just to what came uppermost. You will therefore have to accept what is readiest, what comes direct from the heart, and you must just take that in compensation for any good order of arrangement there might have been in it.

I will endeavour to say nothing that is not true, as far as I can manage, and that is pretty much all that I can engage for. Advices, I believe, to young men—and to all men—are very seldom much valued. There is a great deal of advising, and very little faithful performing. And talk that does not end in any kind of action is better suppressed altogether. I would not, therefore, go much into advising; but there is one advice I must give you. It is, in fact, the summary of all advices, and you have heard it a thousand times, I daresay; but I must, nevertheless, let you hear it the thousand and first time, for it is most intensely true, whether you will believe it at present or not—namely, that above all things the interest of your own life depends upon being diligent now, while it is called to-day, in this place where you have come to get education. Diligent! That includes all virtues in it that a student can have; I mean to include in it all qualities that lead into the acquirement of real instruction and improvement in such a place. If you will believe me, you who are young, yours is the golden season of life. As you have heard it called, so it verily is, the seed-time of life, in which, if you do not sow, or if you sow tares instead of wheat, you cannot expect to reap well afterwards, and you will arrive at indeed little; while in the course of years, when you come to look back, and if you have not done what you have heard from your advisers—and among many counsellors there is wisdom—you will bitterly repent when it is too late. The habits of study acquired at universities are of the highest importance in after-life. At the season when you are in young years the whole mind is, as it were, fluid, and is capable of forming itself into any shape that the owner of the mind pleases to order it to form itself into. The mind is in a fluid state, but it hardens up gradually to the consistency of rock or iron, and you cannot alter the habits of an old man, but as he has begun he will proceed and go on to the last. By diligence, I mean among other things—and very chiefly—honesty in all your inquiries into what you are about. Pursue your studies in the way your conscience calls honest. More and more endeavour to do that. Keep, I mean to say, an accurate separation of what you have really come to know in your own minds, and what is still unknown. Leave all that on the hypothetical side of the barrier, as things afterwards to be acquired, if acquired at all; and be careful not to stamp a thing as known when you do not yet know it. Count a thing known only when it is stamped on your mind, so that you may survey it on all sides with intelligence.

There is such a thing as a man endeavouring to persuade himself, and endeavouring to persuade others, that he knows about things when he does not know more than the outside skin of them; and he goes flourishing about with them. There is also a process called cramming in some universities—that is, getting up such points of things as the examiner is likely to put questions about. Avoid all that as entirely unworthy of an honourable habit. Be modest, and humble, and diligent in your attention to what your teachers tell you, who are profoundly interested in trying to bring you forward in the right way, so far as they have been able to understand it. Try all things they set before you, in order, if possible, to understand them, and to value them in proportion to your fitness for them. Gradually see what kind of work you can do; for it is the first of all problems for a man to find out what kind of work he is to do in this universe. In fact, morality as regards study is, as in all other things, the primary consideration, and overrides all others. A dishonest man cannot do anything real; and it would be greatly better if he were tied up from doing any such thing. He does nothing but darken counsel by the words he utters. That is a very old doctrine, but a very true one; and you will find it confirmed by all the thinking men that have ever lived in this long series of generations of which we are the latest.

I daresay you know, very many of you, that it is now seven hundred years since universities were first set up in this world of ours. Abelard and other people had risen up with doctrines in them the people wished to hear of, and students flocked towards them from all parts of the world. There was no getting the thing recorded in books as you may now. You had to hear

him speaking to you vocally, or else you could not learn at all what it was that he wanted to say. And so they gathered together the various people who had anything to teach, and formed themselves gradually, under the patronage of kings and other potentates who were anxious about the culture of their populations, nobly anxious for their benefit, and became a university.

I daresay, perhaps, you have heard it said that all that is greatly altered by the invention of printing, which took place about midway between us and the origin of universities. A man has not now to go away to where a professor is actually speaking, because in most cases he can get his doctrine out of him through a book, and can read it, and read it again and again, and study it. I don't know that I know of any way in which the whole facts of a subject may be more completely taken in, if our studies are moulded in conformity with it. Nevertheless, universities have, and will continue to have, an indispensable value in society—a very high value. I consider the very highest interests of man vitally entrusted to them.

In regard to theology, as you are aware, it has been the study of the deepest heads that have come into the world—what is the nature of this stupendous universe, and what its relations to all things, as known to man, and as only known to the awful Author of it. In fact, the members of the Church keep theology in a lively condition, for the benefit of the whole population, which is the great object of our universities. I consider it is the same now intrinsically, though very much forgotten, from many causes, and not so successful as might be wished at all. It remains, however, a very curious truth, what has been said by observant people, that the main use of the universities in the present age is that, after you have done with all your classes, the next thing is a collection of books, a great library of good books, which you proceed to study and to read. What the universities have mainly done—what I have found the university did for me—was that it taught me to read in various languages and various sciences, so that I could go into the books that treated of these things, and try anything I wanted to make myself master of gradually, as I found it suit me. Whatever you may think of all that, the clearest and most imperative duty lies on every one of you to be assiduous in your reading; and learn to be good readers, which is, perhaps, a more difficult thing than you imagine. Learn to be discriminative in your reading—to read all kinds of things that you have an interest in, and that you find to be really fit for what you are engaged in. Of course, at the present time, in a great deal of the reading incumbent on you you must be guided by the books recommended to you by your professors for assistance towards the prelections. And then, when you get out of the university, and go into studies of your own, you will find it very important that you have selected a field, a province in which you can study and work.

The most unhappy of all men is the man that cannot tell what he is going to do, that has got no work cut out for him in the world, and does not go into it. For work is the grand cure of all the maladies and miseries that ever beset mankind—honest work, which you intend getting done. If you are in a strait, a very good indication as to choice—perhaps the best you could get—is a book you have a great curiosity about. You are then in the readiest and best of all possible conditions to improve by that book. It is analogous to what doctors tell us about the physical health and appetites of the patient. You must learn to distinguish between false appetite and real. There is such a thing as a false appetite, which will lead a man into vagaries with regard to diet, will tempt him to eat spicy things which he should not eat at all, and would not but that it is toothsome, and for the moment in baseness of mind. A man ought to inquire and find out what he really and truly has an appetite for—what suits his constitution; and that, doctors tell him, is the very thing he ought to have in general. And so with books. As applicable to almost all of you, I will say that it is highly expedient to go into history—to inquire into what has passed before you in the families of men. The history of the Romans and Greeks will first of all concern you; and you will find that all the knowledge you have got will be extremely applicable to elucidate that. There you have the most remarkable race of men in the world set before you, to say nothing of the languages, which your professors can better explain, and which, I believe, are admitted to be the most perfect orders of speech we have yet found to exist among men. And you will find, if you read well, a pair of extremely remarkable nations shining in the records left by themselves as a kind of pillar to light up life in the darkness of the past ages; and it will be well worth your while if you can get into the understanding of what these people were and what they did. You will find a great deal of hearsay, as I have found, that does not touch on the matter; but perhaps some of you will get to see a Roman face to face; you will know in some measure how they contrived to exist, and to perform these feats in the world; I believe, also, you will find a thing not much noted, that there was a very great deal of deep religion in its form in both nations. That is noted by the wisest of historians, and particularly by Ferguson, who is particularly well worth reading on Roman history; and I believe he was an alumnus in our own university. His book is a very creditable book. He points out the profoundly religious nature of the Roman people, notwithstanding the wildness and fero-

ciousness of their nature. They believed that Jupiter Optimus—Jupiter Maximus—was lord of the universe, and that he had appointed the Romans to become the chief of men, provided they followed his commands—to brave all difficulty, and to stand up with an invincible front—to be ready to do and die; and also to have the same sacred regard to veracity, to promise, to integrity, and all the virtues that surround that noblest quality of men—courage—to which the Romans gave the name of virtue, manhood, as the one thing ennobling for a man.

In the literary ages of Rome, that had very much decayed away; but still it had retained its place among the lower classes of the Roman people. Of the deeply religious nature of the Greeks, along with their beautiful and sunny effulgences of art, you have a striking proof, if you look for it.

In the tragedies of Sophocles, there is a most distinct recognition of the eternal justice of Heaven, and the unfailing punishment of crime against the laws of God.

I believe you will find in all histories that that has been at the head and foundation of them all, and that no nation that did not contemplate this wonderful universe with an awe-stricken and reverential feeling that there was a great unknown, omnipotent, and all-wise, and all-virtuous Being, superintending all men in it, and all interests in it—no nation ever came to very much, nor did any man either, who forgot that. If a man did forget that, he forgot the most important part of his mission in this world.

In our own history of England, which you will take a great deal of natural pains to make yourselves acquainted with, you will find it beyond all others worthy of your study; because I believe that the British nation—and I include in them the Scottish nation—produced a finer set of men than any you will find it possible to get anywhere else in the world. I don't know in any history of Greece or Rome where you will get so fine a man as Oliver Cromwell. And we have had men worthy of memory in our little corner of the island here as well as others, and our history has been strong at least in being connected with the world itself—for if you examine well you will find that John Knox was the author, as it were, of Oliver Cromwell; that the Puritan revolution would never have taken place in England at all if it had not been for that Scotchman. This is an arithmetical fact, and is not prompted by national vanity on my part at all. And it is very possible, if you look at the struggle that was going on in England, as I have had to do in my time, you will see that people were overawed with the immense impediments lying in the way.

A small minority of God-fearing men in the country were flying away with any ship they could get to New England, rather than take the lion by the beard. They durstn't confront the powers with their most just complaint to be delivered from idolatry. They wanted to make the nation altogether conformable to the Hebrew Bible, which they understood to be according to the will of God; and there could be no aim more legitimate. However, they could not have got their desire fulfilled at all if Knox had not succeeded by the firmness and nobleness of his mind. For he is also of the select of the earth to me—John Knox. What he has suffered from the ungrateful generations that have followed him should really make us humble ourselves to the dust, to think that the most excellent man our country has produced, to whom we owe everything that distinguishes us among modern nations, should have been sneered at and abused by people. Knox was heard by Scotland—the people heard him with the marrow of their bones—they took up his doctrine, and they defied principalities and powers to move them from it. "We must have it," they said.

It was at that time the Puritan struggle arose in England, and you know well that the Scottish earls and nobility, with their tenantry, marched away to Dunse Hill, and sat down there; and just in the course of that struggle, when it was either to be suppressed or brought into greater vitality, they encamped on the top of Dunse Hill thirty thousand armed men, drilled for that occasion, each regiment around its landlord, its earl, or whatever he might be called, and eager for Christ's Crown and Covenant. That was the signal for all England rising up into unappeasable determination to have the Gospel there also, and you know it went on and came to be a contest whether the Parliament or the king should rule—whether it should be old formalities and use and wont, or something that had been of new conceived in the souls of men—namely, a divine determination to walk according to the laws of God here as the sum of all prosperity—which of these should have the mastery; and after a long, long agony of struggle, it was decided—the way we know. I should say also of that protectorate of Oliver Cromwell's—notwithstanding the abuse it has encountered, and the denial of everybody that it was able to get on in the world, and so on—it appears to me to have been the most salutary thing in the modern history of England on the whole. If Oliver Cromwell had continued it out, I don't know what it would have come to. It would have got corrupted perhaps in other hands, and could not have gone on, but it was pure and true to the last fibre in his mind—there was truth in it when he ruled over it.

Machiavelli has remarked, in speaking about the Romans, that democracy cannot exist anywhere in the world; as a government it is an impossibility that it should be continued, and he goes on proving that in his own way. I do not ask you all to follow him in his conviction; but it is to him a clear truth that it is a solecism

and impossibility that the universal mass of men should govern themselves. He says of the Romans that they continued a long time, but it was purely in virtue of this item in their constitution—namely, that they had all the conviction in their minds that it was solemnly necessary at times to appoint a dictator—a man who had the power of life and death over everything—who degraded men out of their places, ordered them to execution, and did whatever seemed to him good in the name of God above him. He was commanded to take care that the republic suffered no detriment, and Machiavelli calculates that that was the thing that purified the social system from time to time, and enabled it to hang on as it did—an extremely likely thing if it was composed of nothing but bad and tumultuous men triumphing in general over the better, and all going the bad road, in fact. Well, Oliver Cromwell's protectorate, or dictatorate if you will, lasted for about ten years, and you will find that nothing that was contrary to the laws of Heaven was allowed to live by Oliver. For example, it was found by his Parliament, called "Barebones"—the most zealous of all parliaments probably—that the Court of Chancery in England was in a state that was really capable of no apology—no man could get up and say that that was a right court. There were, I think, fifteen thousand or fifteen hundred—I don't really remember which, but we shall call it by the last—there were fifteen hundred cases lying in it undecided; and one of them, I remember, for a large amount of money, was eighty-three years old, and it was going on still. Wigs were waving over it, and lawyers were taking their fees, and there was no end of it; upon which the Barebones people, after deliberation about it, thought it was expedient, and commanded by the Author of Man and the Fountain of Justice, and for the true and right, to abolish the court. Really, I don't know who could have dissented from that opinion. At the same time, it was thought by those who were wiser, and had more experience of the world, that it was a very dangerous thing, and would never suit at all. The lawyers began to make an immense noise about it. All the public, the great mass of solid and well-disposed people who had got no deep insight into such matters, were very adverse to it, and the president of it, old Sir Francis Rous, who translated the Psalms —those that we sing every Sunday in the church yet—a very good man and a wise man—the Provost of Eton—he got the minority, or I don't know whether or no he did not persuade the majority—he, at any rate, got a great number of the Parliament to go to Oliver the Dictator, and lay down their functions altogether, and declare officially with their signature on Monday morning that the Parliament was dissolved.

The thing was passed on Saturday night, and on Monday morning Rous came and said, "We cannot carry on the affair any longer, and we remit it into the hands of your highness." Oliver in that way became protector a second time.

I give you this as an instance that Oliver felt that the Parliament that had been dismissed had been perfectly right with regard to Chancery, and that there was no doubt of the propriety of abolishing Chancery, or reforming it in some kind of way. He considered it, and this is what he did. He assembled sixty of the wisest lawyers to be found in England. Happily, there were men great in the law—men who valued the laws as much as anybody does now, I suppose. Oliver said to them, "Go and examine this thing, and in the name of God inform me what is necessary to be done with regard to it. You will see how we may clean out the foul things in it that render it poison to everybody." Well, they sat down then, and in the course of six weeks—there was no public speaking then, no reporting of speeches, and no trouble of any kind; there was just the business in hand—they got sixty propositions fixed in their minds of the things that required to be done. And upon these sixty propositions Chancery was reconstituted and remodelled, and so it has lasted to our time. It had become a nuisance, and could not have continued much longer.

That is an instance of the manner in which things were done when a dictatorship prevailed in the country, and that was what the dictator did. Upon the whole, I do not think that, in general, out of common history books, you will ever get into the real history of this country, or anything particular which it would beseem you to know. You may read very ingenious and very clever books by men whom it would be the height of insolence in me to do any other thing than express my respect for. But their position is essentially sceptical. Man is unhappily in that condition that he will make only a temporary explanation of anything, and you will not be able, if you are like the man, to understand how this island came to be what it is. You will not find it recorded in books. You will find recorded in books a jumble of tumults, disastrous ineptitudes, and all that kind of thing. But to get what you want you will have to look into side sources, and inquire in all directions.

I remember getting Collins' "Peerage" to read —a very poor peerage as a work of genius, but an excellent book for diligence and fidelity—I was writing on Oliver Cromwell at the time. I could get no biographical dictionary, and I thought the peerage book would help me, at least tell me whether people were old or young; and about all persons concerned in the actions about which I wrote. I got a great deal of help out of poor Collins. He was a diligent and dark London bookseller of about a hundred years ago, who compiled out of all kinds of

treasury chests, archives, books that were authentic, and out of all kinds of things out of which he could get the information he wanted. He was a very meritorious man. I not only found the solution of anything I wanted there, but I began gradually to perceive this immense fact, which I really advise every one of you who read history to look out for and read for—if he has not found it—it was that the kings of England all the way from the Norman Conquest down to the times of Charles I. had appointed, so far as they knew, those who deserved to be appointed, peers. They were all royal men, with minds full of justice and valour and humanity, and all kinds of qualities that are good for men to have who ought to rule over others. Then their genealogy was remarkable—and there is a great deal more in genealogies than is generally believed at present.

I never heard tell of any clever man that came out of entirely stupid people. If you look around the families of your acquaintance, you will see such cases in all directions. I know that it has been the case in mine. I can trace the father, and the son, and the grandson, and the family stamp is quite distinctly legible upon each of them, so that it goes for a great deal—the hereditary principle in government as in other things; and it must be recognised so soon as there is any fixity in things.

You will remark that if at any time the genealogy of a peerage fails—if the man that actually holds the peerage is a fool in these earnest striking times, the man gets into mischief and gets into treason—he gets himself extinguished altogether, in fact.

From these documents of old Collins it seems that a peer conducts himself in a solemn, good, pious, manly kind of way when he takes leave of life, and when he has hospitable habits, and is valiant in his procedure throughout; and that in general a king, with a noble approximation to what was right, had nominated this man, saying, "Come you to me, sir; come out of the common level of the people, where you are liable to be trampled upon; come here and take a district of country and make it into your own image more or less; be a king under me, and understand that that is your function." I say this is the most divine thing that a human being can do to other human beings, and no kind of being whatever has so much of the character of God Almighty's divine government as that thing we see that went all over England, and that is the grand soul of England's history.

It is historically true that down to the time of Charles I., it was not understood that any man was made a peer without having a merit in him to constitute him a proper subject for a peerage. In Charles I.'s time it grew to be known or said that if a man was by birth a gentleman, and was worth £10,000 a year, and bestowed his gifts up and down among courtiers, he could be made a peer. Under Charles II. it went on with still more rapidity, and has been going on with ever-increasing velocity until we see the perfect break-neck pace at which they are now going. And now a peerage is a paltry kind of thing to what it was in these old times. I could go into a great many more details about things of that sort, but I must turn to another branch of the subject.

One remark more about your reading. I do not know whether it has been sufficiently brought home to you that there are two kinds of books. When a man is reading on any kind of subject, in most departments of books—in all books, if you take it in a wide sense—you will find that there is a division of good books and bad books—there is a good kind of a book and a bad kind of a book. I am not to assume that you are all ill acquainted with this; but I may remind you that it is a very important consideration at present. It casts aside altogether the idea that people have that if they are reading any book—that if an ignorant man is reading any book, he is doing rather better than nothing at all. I entirely call that in question. I even venture to deny it. It would be much safer and better would he have no concern with books at all than with some of them. You know these are my views. There are a number, an increasing number, of books that are decidedly to him not useful. But he will learn also that a certain number of books were written by a supreme, noble kind of people—not a very great number—but a great number adhere more or less to that side of things. In short, as I have written it down somewhere else, I conceive that books are like men's souls—divided into sheep and goats. Some of them are calculated to be of very great advantage in teaching—in forwarding the teaching of all generations. Others are going down, down, doing more and more, wilder and wilder mischief.

And for the rest, in regard to all your studies here, and whatever you may learn, you are to remember that the object is not particular knowledge—that you are going to get higher in technical perfections, and all that sort of thing. There is a higher aim lies at the rear of all that, especially among those who are intended for literary, for speaking pursuits—the sacred profession. You are ever to bear in mind that there lies behind that the acquisition of what may be called wisdom—namely, sound appreciation and just decision as to all the objects that come round about you, and the habit of behaving with justice and wisdom. In short, great is wisdom—great is the value of wisdom. It cannot be exaggerated. The highest achievement of man—"Blessed is he that getteth understanding." And that, I believe, occasionally may be missed very easily; but never more easily than now, I think. If that is a failure, all is a failure. However, I will not touch further upon that matter.

In this university I learn from many sides that there is a great and considerable stir about endowments. Oh, I should have said in regard to book reading, if it be so very important, how very useful would an excellent library be in every university. I hope that will not be neglected by those gentlemen who have charge of you—and, indeed, I am happy to hear that your library is very much improved since the time I knew it; and I hope it will go on improving more and more. You require money to do that, and you require also judgment in the selectors of the books—pious insight into what is really for the advantage of human souls, and the exclusion of all kinds of clap-trap books which merely excite the astonishment of foolish people. Wise books—as much as possible good books.

As I was saying, there appears to be a great demand for endowments — an assiduous and praiseworthy industry for getting new funds collected for encouraging the ingenious youth of universities, especially in this the chief university of the country. Well, I entirely participate in everybody's approval of the movement. It is very desirable. It should be responded to, and one expects most assuredly will. At least, if it is not, it will be shameful to the country of Scotland, which never was so rich in money as at the present moment, and never stood so much in need of getting noble universities to counteract many influences that are springing up alongside of money. It should not be backward in coming forward in the way of endowments, at least, in rivalry to our rude old barbarous ancestors, as we have been pleased to call them. Such munificence as theirs is beyond all praise, to whom I am sorry to say we are not yet by any manner of means equal or approaching equality. There is an overabundance of money, and sometimes I cannot help thinking that, probably, never has there been at any other time in Scotland the hundredth part of the money that now is, or even the thousandth part, for wherever I go there is that gold-nuggeting, that prosperity.

Many men are counting their balances by millions. Money was never so abundant, and nothing that is good to be done with it. No man knows—or very few men know—what benefit to get out of his money. In fact, it too often is secretly a curse to him. Much better for him never to have had any. But I do not expect that generally to be believed. Nevertheless, I should think it a beautiful relief to any man that has an honest purpose struggling in him to bequeath a handsome house of refuge, so to speak, for some meritorious man who may hereafter be born into the world, to enable him a little to get on his way. To do, in fact, as those old Norman kings whom I have described to you—to raise a man out of the dirt and mud where he is getting trampled, unworthily on his part, into some kind of position where he may acquire the power to do some good in his generation. I hope that as much as possible will be done in that way; that efforts will not be relaxed till the thing is in a satisfactory state. At the same time, in regard to the classical department of things, it is to be desired that it were properly supported—that we could allow people to go and devote more leisure possibly to the cultivation of particular departments.

We might have more of this from Scotch universities than we have. I am bound, however, to say that it does not appear as if of late times endowment was the real soul of the matter. The English, for example, are the richest people for endowments on the face of the earth in their universities; and it is a remarkable fact that since the time of Bentley you cannot name anybody that has gained a great name in scholarship among them, or constituted a point of revolution in the pursuits of men in that way. The man that did that is a man worthy of being remembered among men, although he may be a poor man, and not endowed with worldly wealth. One man that actually did constitute a revolution was the son of a poor weaver in Saxony, who edited his "Tibullus" in Dresden in the room of a poor comrade, and who, while he was editing his "Tibullus," had to gather his pease-cod shells on the streets and boil them for his dinner. That was his endowment. But he was recognised soon to have done a great thing. His name was Heyne.

I can remember it was quite a revolution in my mind when I got hold of that man's book on Virgil. I found that for the first time I had understood him—that he had introduced me for the first time into an insight of Roman life, and pointed out the circumstances in which these were written, and here was interpretation; and it has gone on in all manner of development, and has spread out into other countries.

Upon the whole, there is one reason why endowments are given now as they were in old days, when they founded abbeys, colleges, and all kinds of things of that description, with such success as we know. All that has changed now. Why that has decayed away may in part be that people have become doubtful that colleges are now the real sources of that which I call wisdom, whether they are anything more — anything much more—than a cultivating of man in the specific arts. In fact, there has been a suspicion of that kind in the world for a long time. That is an old saying, an old proverb, "An ounce of mother wit is worth a pound of clergy." There is a suspicion that a man is perhaps not nearly so wise as he looks, or because he has poured out speech so copiously.

When the seven free arts on which the old universities were based came to be modified a little, in order to be convenient for or to promote the wants of modern society — though,

perhaps, some of them are obsolete enough even yet for some of us—there arose a feeling that mere vocality, mere culture of speech, if that is what comes out of a man, though he may be a great speaker, an eloquent orator, yet there is no real substance there—if that is what was required and aimed at by the man himself, and by the community that set him upon becoming a learned man. Maid-servants, I hear people complaining, are getting instructed in the "ologies," and so on, and are apparently totally ignorant of brewing, boiling, and baking; above all things, not taught what is necessary to be known, from the highest to the lowest—strict obedience, humility, and correct moral conduct. Oh, it is a dismal chapter, all that, if one went into it!

What has been done by rushing after fine speech? I have written down some very fierce things about that, perhaps considerably more emphatic that I would wish them to be now; but they are deeply my conviction. There is very great necessity indeed of getting a little more silent than we are. It seems to me the finest nations of the world—the English and the American—are going all away into wind and tongue. But it will appear sufficiently tragical by-and-by, long after I am away out of it. Silence is the eternal duty of a man. He won't get to any real understanding of what is complex, and, what is more than any other, pertinent to his interests, without maintaining silence. "Watch the tongue," is a very old precept, and a most true one. I do not want to discourage any of you from your Demosthenes, and your studies of the niceties of language, and all that. Believe me, I value that as much as any of you. I consider it a very graceful thing, and a proper thing, for every human creature to know what the implement which he uses in communicating his thoughts is, and how to make the very utmost of it. I want you to study Demosthenes, and know all his excellences. At the same time, I must say that speech does not seem to me, on the whole, to have turned to any good account.

Why tell me that a man is a fine speaker if it is not the truth that he is speaking? Phocion, who did not speak at all, was a great deal nearer hitting the mark than Demosthenes. He used to tell the Athenians—"You can't fight Philip. You have not the slightest chance with him. He is a man who holds his tongue; he has great disciplined armies; he can brag anybody you like in your cities here; and he is going on steadily with an unvarying aim towards his object: and he will infallibly beat any kind of men such as you, going on raging from shore to shore with all that rampant nonsense." Demosthenes said to him one day—"The Athenians will get mad some day and kill you." "Yes," Phocion says, "when they are mad; and you as soon as they get sane again"

It is also told about him going to Messina on some deputation that the Athenians wanted on some kind of matter of an intricate and contentious nature, that Phocion went with some story in his mouth to speak about. He was a man of few words—no unveracity; and after he had gone on telling the story a certain time there was one burst of interruption. One man interrupted with something he tried to answer, and then another; and, finally, the people began bragging and bawling, and no end of debate, till it ended in the want of power in the people to say any more. Phocion drew back altogether, struck dumb, and would not speak another word to any man; and he left it to them to decide in any way they liked.

It appears to me there is a kind of eloquence in that which is equal to anything Demosthenes ever said—"Take your own way, and let me out altogether."

All these considerations, and manifold more connected with them—innumerable considerations, resulting from observation of the world at this moment—have led many people to doubt of the salutary effect of vocal education altogether. I do not mean to say it should be entirely excluded; but I look to something that will take hold of the matter much more closely, and not allow it slip out of our fingers, and remain worse than it was. For if a good speaker—an eloquent speaker—is not speaking the truth, is there a more horrid kind of object in creation? Of such speech I hear all manner and kind of people say it is excellent; but I care very little about how he said it, provided I understand it, and it be true. Excellent speaker! but what if he is telling me things that are untrue, that are not the fact about it—if he has formed a wrong judgment about it—if he has no judgment in his mind to form a right conclusion in regard to the matter? An excellent speaker of that kind is, as it were, saying—"Ho, every one that wants to be persuaded of the thing that is not true, come hither." I would recommend you to be very chary of that kind of excellent speech.

Well, all that being the too well-known product of our method of vocal education—the mouth merely operating on the tongue of the pupil, and teaching him to wag it in a particular way—it had made a great many thinking men entertain a very great distrust of this not very salutary way of procedure, and they have longed for some kind of practical way of working out the business. There would be room for a great deal of description about it if I went into it; but I must content myself with saying that the most remarkable piece of reading that you may be recommended to take and try if you can study is a book by Goethe—one of his last books, which he wrote when he was an old man, about seventy years of age—I think one of the most beautiful he ever wrote, full of mild wisdom, and which is found to be very touching

by those who have eyes to discern and hearts to feel it. It is one of the pieces in "Wilhelm Meister's Travels." I read it through many years ago; and, of course, I had to read into it very hard when I was translating it, and it has always dwelt in my mind as about the most remarkable bit of writing that I have known to be executed in these late centuries. I have often said, there are ten pages of that which, if ambition had been my only rule, I would rather have written than have written all the books that have appeared since I came into the world. Deep, deep is the meaning of what is said there. They turn on the Christian religion and the religious phenomena of Christian life—altogether sketched out in the most airy, graceful, delicately-wise kind of way, so as to keep himself out of the common controversies of the street and of the forum, yet to indicate what was the result of things he had been long meditating upon. Among others, he introduces, in an aërial, flighty kind of way, here and there a touch which grows into a beautiful picture—a scheme of entirely mute education, at least with no more speech than is absolutely necessary for what they have to do.

Three of the wisest men that can be got are met to consider what is the function which transcends all others in importance to build up the young generation, which shall be free from all that perilous stuff that has been weighing us down and clogging every step, and which is the only thing we can hope to go on with if we would leave the world a little better, and not the worse of our having been in it for those who are to follow. The man who is the eldest of the three says to Goethe, "You give by nature to the well-formed children you bring into the world a great many precious gifts, and very frequently these are best of all developed by nature herself, with a very slight assistance where assistance is seen to be wise and profitable, and forbearance very often on the part of the overlooker of the process of education; but there is one thing that no child brings into the world with it, and without which all other things are of no use." Wilhelm, who is there beside him, says, "What is that?" "All who enter the world want it," says the eldest; "perhaps yourself." Wilhelm says, "Well, tell me what it is." "It is," says the eldest, "reverence—*Ehrfurcht*—Reverence! Honour done to those who are grander and better than you, without fear; distinct from fear." *Ehrfurcht*—"the soul of all religion that ever has been among men, or ever will be." And he goes into practicality. He practically distinguishes the kinds of religion that are in the world, and he makes out three reverences. The boys are all trained to go through certain gesticulations, to lay their hands on their breast and look up to heaven, and they give their three reverences. The first and simplest is that of reverence for what is above us. It is the soul of all the pagan religions; there is nothing better in man than that. Then there is reverence for what is around us or about us—reverence for our equals—and to which he attributes an immense power in the culture of man. The third is reverence for what is beneath us—to learn to recognise in pain, sorrow, and contradiction, even in those things, odious as they are to flesh and blood—to learn that there lies in these a priceless blessing. And he defines that as being the soul of the Christian religion—the highest of all religions; a height, as Goethe says—and that is very true, even to the letter, as I consider—a height to which the human species was fated and enabled to attain, and from which, having once attained it, it can never retrograde. It cannot descend down below that permanently, Goethe's idea is.

Often one thinks it was good to have a faith of that kind—that always, even in the most degraded, sunken, and unbelieving times, he calculates there will be found some few souls who will recognise what that meant; and that the world, having once received it, there is no fear of its retrograding. He goes on then to tell us the way in which they seek to teach boys, in the sciences particularly, whatever the boy is fit for. Wilhelm left his own boy there, expecting they would make him a Master of Arts, or something of that kind; and when he came back for him he saw a thundering cloud of dust coming over the plain, of which he could make nothing. It turned out to be a tempest of wild horses, managed by young lads who had a turn for hunting with their grooms. His own son was among them, and he found that the breaking of colts was the thing he was most suited for. This is what Goethe calls Art, which I should not make clear to you by any definition unless it is clear already. I would not attempt to define it as music, painting, and poetry, and so on; it is in quite a higher sense than the common one, and in which, I am afraid, most of our painters, poets, and music men would not pass muster. He considers that the highest pitch to which human culture can go; and he watches with great industry how it is to be brought about with men who have a turn for it.

Very wise and beautiful it is. It gives one an idea that something greatly better is possible for man in the world. I confess it seems to me it is a shadow of what will come, unless the world is to come to a conclusion that is perfectly frightful; some kind of scheme of education like that, presided over by the wisest and most sacred men that can be got in the world, and watching from a distance—a training in practicality at every turn; no speech in it except that speech that is to be followed by action, for that ought to be the rule as nearly as possible among them. For rarely should men speak at all unless it is to say that thing that is to be done; and let him go and do his part in it, and to say no more

about it. I should say there is nothing in the world you can conceive so difficult, *prima facie*, as that of getting a set of men gathered together—rough, rude, and ignorant people—gather them together, promise them a shilling a day, rank them up, give them very severe and sharp drill, and by bullying and drill—for the word "drill" seems as if it meant the treatment that would force them to learn—they learn what it is necessary to learn; and there is the man, a piece of an animated machine, a wonder of wonders to look at. He will go and obey one man, and walk into the cannon's mouth for him, and do anything whatever that is commanded of him by his general officer. And I believe all manner of things in this way could be done if there were anything like the same attention bestowed. Very many things could be regimented and organised into the mute system of education that Goethe evidently adumbrates there. But I believe, when people look into it, it will be found that they will not be very long in trying to make some efforts in that direction; for the saving of human labour, and the avoidance of human misery, would be uncountable if it were set about and begun even in part.

Alas! it is painful to think how very far away it is—any fulfilment of such things; for I need not hide from you, young gentlemen—and that is one of the last things I am going to tell you—that you have got into a very troublous epoch of the world; and I don't think you will find it improve the footing you have, though you have many advantages which we had not. You have careers open to you, by public examinations and so on, which is a thing much to be approved, and which we hope to see perfected more and more. All that was entirely unknown in my time, and you have many things to recognise as advantages. But you will find the ways of the world more anarchical than ever, I think. As far as I have noticed, revolution has come upon us. We have got into the age of revolutions. All kinds of things are coming to be subjected to fire, as it were; hotter and hotter the wind rises around everything.

Curious to say, now in Oxford and other places that used to seem to lie at anchor in the stream of time, regardless of all changes, they are getting into the highest humour of mutation, and all sorts of new ideas are getting afloat. It is evident that whatever is not made of asbestos will have to be burnt in this world. It will not stand the heat it is getting exposed to. And in saying that, it is but saying in other words that we are in an epoch of anarchy—anarchy *plus* the constable. There is nobody that picks one's pocket without some policeman being ready to take him up. But in every other thing he is the son, not of Kosmos, but of Chaos. He is a disobedient, and reckless, and altogether a waste kind of object—a commonplace man in these epochs; and the wiser kind of man—the select, of whom I hope you will be part—has more and more a set time to it to look forward, and will require to move with double wisdom; and will find, in short, that the crooked things that he has to pull straight in his own life, or round about, wherever he may be, are manifold, and will task all his strength wherever he may go.

But why should I complain of that either? for that is a thing a man is born to in all epochs. He is born to expend every particle of strength that God Almighty has given him, in doing the work he finds he is fit for—to stand it out to the last breath of life, and do his best. We are called upon to do that; and the reward we all get—which we are perfectly sure of if we have merited it—is that we have got the work done, or, at least, that we have tried to do the work; for that is a great blessing in itself; and I should say there is not very much more reward than that going on in this world. If the man gets meat and clothes, what matters it whether he have £10,000, or £10,000,000, or £70 a year. He can get meat and clothes for that; and he will find very little difference intrinsically, if he is a wise man.

I warmly second the advice of the wisest of men—"Don't be ambitious; don't be at all too desirous to success; be loyal and modest." Cut down the proud towering thoughts that you get into you, or see they be pure as well as high. There is a nobler ambition than the gaining of all California would be, or the getting of all the suffrages that are on the planet just now.

Finally, gentlemen, I have one advice to give you, which is practically of very great importance, though a very humble one.

I have no doubt you will have among you people ardently bent to consider life cheap, for the purpose of getting forward in what they are aiming at of high; and you are to consider throughout, much more than is done at present, that health is a thing to be attended to continually—that you are to regard that as the very highest of all temporal things for you. There is no kind of achievement you could make in the world that is equal to perfect health. What are nuggets and millions? The French financier said, "Alas! why is there no sleep to be sold?" Sleep was not in the market at any quotation.

It is a curious thing that I remarked long ago, and have often turned in my head, that the old word for "holy" in the German language—*heilig*—also means "healthy." And so *Heilbronn* means "holy-well," or "healthy-well." We have in the Scotch "hale;" and I suppose our English word "whole"—with a "w"—all of one piece, without any hole in it—is the same word. I find that you could not get any better definition of what "holy" really is than "healthy—completely healthy." *Mens sana in corpore sano.*

A man with his intellect a clear, plain, geometric mirror, brilliantly sensitive of all objects and impressions around it, and imagining all things in their correct proportions—not twisted up into convex or concave, and distorting everything, so that he cannot see the truth of the matter without endless groping and manipulation—healthy, clear, and free, and all round about him. We never can attain that at all. In fact, the operations we have got into are destructive of it. You cannot, if you are going to do any decisive intellectual operation—if you are going to write a book—at least, I never could—without getting decidedly made ill by it, and really you must if it is your business—and you must follow out what you are at—and it sometimes is at the expense of health. Only remember at all times to get back as fast as possible out of it into health, and regard the real equilibrium as the centre of things. You should always look at the *heilig*, which means holy, and holy means healthy.

Well, that old etymology—what a lesson it is against certain gloomy, austere, ascetic people, that have gone about as if this world were all a dismal prison-house! It has, indeed, got all the ugly things in it that I have been alluding to; but there is an eternal sky over it, and the blessed sunshine, verdure of spring, and rich autumn, and all that in it, too. Piety does not mean that a man should make a sour face about things, and refuse to enjoy in moderation what his Maker has given. Neither do you find it to have been so with old Knox. If you look into him you will find a beautiful Scotch humour in him, as well as the grimmest and sternest truth when necessary, and a great deal of laughter. We find really some of the sunniest glimpses of things come out of Knox that I have seen in any man; for instance, in his "History of the Reformation," which is a book I hope every one of you will read—a glorious book.

On the whole, I would bid you stand up to your work, whatever it may be, and not be afraid of it—not in sorrows or contradiction to yield, but pushing on towards the goal. And don't suppose that people are hostile to you in the world. You will rarely find anybody designedly doing you ill. You may feel often as if the whole world is obstructing you, more or less; but you will find that to be because the world is travelling in a different way from you, and rushing on in its own path. Each man has only an extremely goodwill to himself—which he has a right to have—and is moving on towards his object. Keep out of literature as a general rule, I should say also. If you find many people who are hard and indifferent to you in a world that you consider to be unhospitable and cruel—as often, indeed, happens to a tender-hearted, stirring young creature—you will also find there are noble hearts who will look kindly on you, and their help will be precious to you beyond price. You will get good and evil as you go on, and have the success that has been appointed to you.

I will wind up with a small bit of verse that is from Goethe also, and has often gone through my mind. To me it has the tone of a modern psalm in it in some measure. It is sweet and clear. The clearest of sceptical men had not anything like so clear a mind as that man had—freer from cant and misdirected notion of any kind than any man in these ages has been. This is what the poet says:

"The Future hides in it
Gladness and sorrow;
We press still thorow;
Nought that abides in it
Daunting us—Onward!

And solemn before us,
Veiled, the dark Portal,
Goal of all mortal.
Stars silent rest o'er us—
Graves under us, silent.

While earnest thou gazest
Comes boding of terror,
Come phantasm and error;
Perplexes the bravest
With doubt and misgiving.

But heard are the voices,
Heard are the Sages,
The Worlds and the Ages:
'Choose well: your choice is
Brief, and yet endless.'

Here eyes do regard you
In Eternity's stillness;
Here is all fulness,
Ye brave, to reward you.
Work, and despair not." *

One last word. *Wir heissen euch hoffen*—we bid you be of hope. Adieu for this time.

* Originally published in Carlyle's "Past and Present," p. 318.

LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

1792-1878.

THE REFORM BILL OF 1831-32.*

I BELIEVE, sir, that I have now done with the exposition of our plan, and with the principal objections which may be brought against it. There is, indeed, one objection, sir, and that a very comprehensive one, to which I have not yet alluded; that is the question which may be put to us, as to what benefit we hope to confer upon the people by our plan of reform. We may be asked, "Will you relieve the distresses of the people by reform; or will you not leave them precisely as they are?" But, sir, I say that such a question is totally irrelevant to the matter. Sir, it might just as well be objected to my noble friend's intentions to relieve the people by taking off the duty on coals: "Oh, what signifies your reduction? It does nothing whatever towards improving the constitution." Any gentleman might just as well arraign my noble friend in this way as tell me that this bill will not improve the condition or increase the comforts of the poor. Nor am I one of those who would debate the theory on which such expectations are founded. I am not one of those, sir, who would hold out to the people vain hopes of immediate benefit from this measure which it could not realise. Neither am I one of those who maintain the opposite theory, such as is expressed in a well-known couplet, which I remember to have been once quoted by the late Lord Liverpool:

> "How small, of all that human hearts endure,
> That part which laws or kings can cause or cure."

Far am I from agreeing in the opinion which the poet has so well expressed in those lines. They are very pretty poetry, but they are not true in politics. When I look to one country as compared to another, at the different epochs of their history, I am forced to believe that it is upon law and government that the prosperity and morality, the power and intelligence, of every nation depend. When I compare Spain (in which the traveller is met by the stiletto in the streets, and by the carbine in high roads) to England, in the poorest parts of which the traveller passes without fear, I think the difference is occasioned by the different governments under which the people live. At least, sir, it cannot be denied that the end attained by the two governments of these respective countries is essentially different. Is it possible, indeed, for any intelligent person to travel through countries and not trace the characters and conduct of the inhabitants to the nature of their institutions and government? When I propose, therefore, a reform of Parliament—when I propose that the people shall send into this House real representatives, to deliberate on their wants, and to consult for their interests—to consider their grievances, and attend to their desires—when I propose that they shall in fact, as they hitherto have been said to do in theory, possess the vast power of holding the purse-strings of the monarch, I do it under the conviction that I am laying the foundation of the greatest improvement in the comforts and well-being of the people. Let what will be done, the laws of such an assembly will not be voted by men hurrying from the country, almost ignorant for what purpose, and arriving in this House at twelve o'clock at night, in time to give a vote upon a subject of which they have scarcely heard, and which they have never considered. In such an assembly the representatives of the people will consider, not with whom they are voting, but for what measure they vote. The measures of such an assembly will be deliberately weighed—and will be carefully designed to remedy the evils which may have been brought upon the country by bad laws, and to rescue it from their operation. When I am told that the government of a country does not affect the condition of a people, I say look to Ireland. What has caused the state of that country to be such as it now is? What, but the want of due, kind, paternal attention on the part of its government—a want of fellow-feeling in the legislature with the great mass of the people? I say, then, that if we identify this House with the people of the three kingdoms, if we give England, Ireland, and Scotland the right of having legitimate representatives in Parliament, however slow may be our progress—however we may be reproached by the factious for the tardiness of our advance in giving to the people all the rights and privileges they claim, we provide for carrying into effect the acknowledged principles of the constitution, preserving undiminished the prerogatives of the Crown, the authority of Parliament, and the rights and liberties of the nation, guarded by the faithful representatives of a free people and the loyal subjects of a generous king. I move, sir, for leave to bring in a bill to amend the representation of England and Wales.

* From a speech delivered in the House of Commons, June 24, 1831.

RICHARD LALOR SHEIL.

1794-1851.

THE STATE OF IRELAND.

ENGLISHMEN, look at Ireland! what do you behold?—a beautiful country with wonderful agricultural and commercial advantages—the link between America and Europe—the natural resting-place of trade on its way to either hemisphere; indented with havens, watered by deep and numerous rivers, with a fortunate climate, and a soil teeming with easy fertility, and inhabited by a bold, intrepid, and—with all their faults—a generous and enthusiastic people.

Such is natural Ireland; what is artificial Ireland? Such is Ireland as God made her; what is Ireland as England made her?

This fine country is laden with a population the most miserable in Europe. Your domestic swine are better housed than the people. Harvests, the most abundant, are reaped by men with starvation in their faces; famine covers a fruitful soil; and disease inhales a pure atmosphere; all the great commercial facilities of the country are lost; the deep rivers, that should circulate opulence, and turn the machinery of a thousand manufactures, flow to the ocean without wafting a boat or turning a wheel, and the wave breaks in solitude in the silent magnificence of deserted and shipless harbours.

Instead of being a source of wealth and revenue to the empire, Ireland cannot defray her own expenses, or pay a single tax. Instead of being a bulwark and fortress, she debilitates, exhausts, and endangers England, and offers an allurement to the speculators in universal ruin.

The great mass of her enormous population is alienated and dissociated from the state; the influence of the constituted and legitimate authorities is gone; a strange, anomalous, and unexampled kind of government has sprung up from the public passions; and exercises a despotic sway over the great mass of the community; while the class inferior in numbers, but accustomed to authority, and infuriated at its loss, are thrown into formidable reaction. The most ferocious passions rage from one extremity of the country to the other. Hundreds and thousands of men, arrayed with badges, gather in the south; and the smaller factions, with discipline and arms, are marshalled in the north. The country is strewed with the materials of civil commotion, and seems like one vast magazine of powder, which a spark might ignite into an explosion that would shake the whole fabric of civil society into ruin, and of which England would perhaps never recover the shock.

RUSSIAN AND TURKISH TREATIES.*

I shall endeavour, in discharging the duty I have undertaken, to avoid a spirit of partisanship, which, in a question of this kind, would be peculiarly out of place, and simply to present to the House the facts which I conceive should induce the noble lord at the head of the foreign department, to furnish the House and the public with the documents I seek to have produced. The motion I have risen to make is this: "That an humble address be presented to his Majesty, that he will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, copies of any treaty or treaties which have been concluded between the Russian and Turkish Governments since the 1st of January 1833, and which have been officially communicated to the British Government; together with copies of any correspondence between his Majesty's Government and the Russian and Turkish Governments, relative to the said treaties."

I proceed at once to the statement of the facts, the incidents, and the documents, on which I rely. I shall not take any remote period, but commence at the autumn of the year 1831. In the autumn of that year, the forces of the Pacha of Egypt began their march; on the 3d of December 1831, the siege of Acre was commenced; in May 1832 Acre fell; Ibrahim proceeded on his march, and advanced into Syria; on the 14th of June, Damascus was taken. In July 1832 another great battle was fought, and Ibrahim advanced upon Taurus; he passed it. Any one who will give the slightest examination to the relative position of the two armies must see that the success of Ibrahim was inevitable. This was the state of affairs in July 1832. What was the course adopted by Turkey? She applied for aid to England. The fact is admitted, in a speech made by the noble lord in this House on the 11th of July 1833. It was further admitted by the noble lord, that if this country had then thought proper to interfere, its interference would have been effectual.

Lord PALMERSTON—No.

Mr SHEIL—It is so stated. It has also been stated, but I know not whether on good author-

* Speech in the House of Commons, March 17, 1834.

ity, that the application of Turkey to this country for assistance was sustained by Russia, which power is said to have intimated her wish, or solicited, that the aid asked by Turkey should be given: England refused her assistance. That fact will not be questioned; it remains to be explained. It was asked at the time, why assistance was not given to our ancient ally? But the events which subsequently happened, gave retrospective force to the interrogatory; for it is impossible not to ask, with a sentiment stronger than mere curiosity, why it was that Turkey, when she sought our assistance, was thrown upon Russia as her only resource? The refusal having been given, is it not a most extraordinary circumstance that England sent an ambassador to Constantinople? The war began in October 1831; Acre fell in May 1832; Damascus, in June 1832; the Taurus was passed; aid was asked from and refused by England; and yet no ambassador was sent from England! Let the noble lord, if he will have the goodness to note the questions I ask in the course of my statement, tell us how it happened that the war had been concluded two months before the English minister arrived at Constantinople? The battle of Koniah was fought on the 21st of September 1832; and although this progress of Ibrahim attracted the attention of Europe, it does not seem to have induced the English cabinet to give any acceleration to the movements of my Lord Ponsonby. He was appointed, I believe, in December 1832; but he did not arrive in Constantinople till May 1833, after the battle of Koniah had been fought, and application had been made by Turkey to Russia; and, indeed, after—as is stated upon authority, I believe, worthy of credit, and which it will remain for the noble lord to confirm or contradict—Russia had written to the sultan in the language of fraternal or diplomatic endearment, making him a tender of the assistance of Russia, whether that assistance was required by sea or by land. On the 17th of February, the French admiral, Roussin, arrived at Constantinople, and this leads me to remark upon a circumstance deserving of notice. It is this—that not England, but France, had no ambassador at Constantinople during the progress of the events I have mentioned. The reason of France being thus situated, is said to be, that General Guilleminot, who had been there as ambassador, having suggested to the Porte, on the breaking out of the Polish insurrection, that that was a good opportunity to repair the disasters and injuries of the war which terminated in the treaty of Adrianople, Prince Pozzo di Borgo applied to the French minister, Sebastiani, to have him removed. I mention this as a kind of excuse for England, because France, having only a *chargé d'affaires*, it may be said that we were not called upon to have more than a secretary of legation. Admiral Roussin having arrived on the 17th of February, he, on the 19th of February, remonstrated with the divan, on the fatal effects to the Turkish empire which must result from calling in Russia as an auxiliary. On the very next day the Russian fleet appeared in the Bosphorus. There was, however, no immediate disembarkation. The French admiral remonstrated, but the English ambassador was not there to remonstrate, for Lord Ponsonby was relieving himself at Naples from the fatigues of his diplomatic negotiations in Belgium. An effort was made by him, however, to induce Ibrahim to retreat, but all it led to was the raising a question respecting the possession of Armenia. In that question, Admiral Roussin said he would not interfere, not wishing to concern himself in the domestic quarrels of the parties. He accordingly retired, and 20,000 Russians encamped on the Asiatic shore of the Bosphorus. Complete possession having been taken of Constantinople, Count Orloff arrived, if not before Lord Ponsonby, to much better purpose; for, whilst he seemed to be engaged in the show and festivities of the capital, on the illuminations of their Seraglio, he was all the while effecting a clandestine treaty with the sultan, not only without the intervention, but without the knowledge of the English or French embassies. That was the treaty of the 8th of July, the production of which I seek from the noble lord. I have now, by a succinct narrative, brought down my statement to that important period, the 8th of July 1833, the date of the subjugation of Turkey; not, I hope, of the dishonour of England. When was that treaty known by the noble lord? I may mention, by the way, a remarkable circumstance which took place in the House of Commons on the 11th of July.

My honourable friend who sits beside me (the member for Coventry) moved for certain papers respecting the recent transactions between Russia, Turkey, and Mehemet Ali. On that occasion the noble lord opposite pronounced a speech, reflecting the highest credit on his diplomatic abilities. The noble lord stated, as a reason for not producing the papers, that events to which they related could hardly be said to be brought to a close, and that the documents asked for ought not to be produced, till a diplomatic wind-up had been arrived at. But he expressed sentiments worthy of a proselyte of Mr Canning, observing that it was quite a mistake to suppose that England was not prepared to go to war if honour and dignity required it; mentioning, at the same time, that assistance had been refused to Turkey. This being on the 11th of July, the noble lord, of course, was not aware of the treaty of the 8th of July. How did the English public become acquainted with that treaty? Or perhaps, the more proper question would be—how did the noble lord become acquainted with it? The noble lord obtained his first information touching, I will not say,

the details and particulars, but the substance of that treaty, from a letter which appeared in the *Morning Herald* on the 21st of August 1833, from its correspondent at Constantinople. In this letter it was stated that Count Orloff had succeeded completely in throwing dust into the eyes of the English and French ambassadors; for that, whilst he appeared to be absorbed in all the gaieties of the Turkish metropolis, he was in reality prosecuting the deep and dark designs which Russia had so long entertained; and that on the 8th of July he had induced the sultan to conclude an offensive and defensive treaty, admitting the virtual surrender to Russian dominion of all the rights of Turkey.

The particulars of that treaty, beyond three articles, the writer did not pretend to know; but he added, that the next day Count Orloff set off for St Petersburgh; that the greatest confusion and dismay prevailed among the other diplomatic bodies; and that they had despatched couriers to their respective courts. This letter was brought under the attention of the House of Commons on the 24th of August, by the honourable and gallant member for Westminster; on which occasion the noble lord stated in his place, that of the treaty of the 8th of July he officially knew nothing whatever; the only information he had upon the subject being through the medium of the public journals, upon whose activity he passed a just panegyric—an activity which certainly, on that occasion, much surpassed that of the agents of the Government. The noble lord, on that occasion, admitted a second time that Turkey had asked for assistance from England before applying for it to Russia. I have now brought myself down to the 24th of August 1833. On the 29th of August, the king delivered his speech from the throne on the prorogation of Parliament. With these facts, or these rumours which, at all events, ultimately turned out fatal facts—with all these circumstances before it—the cabinet advised his Majesty to declare in his speech from the throne—and that speech must constitutionally be considered the speech of his Majesty's ministers—that the relation between Turkey and England remained undisturbed.

Let the House bear in mind that the noble lord, if he had not received the despatch forwarded to him on the 9th of July, certainly had had his attention called to the treaty of the 8th of July or the 14th of August; and yet persuades his colleagues to advise his Majesty to say on the 29th of August:

"The hostilities which had disturbed the peace of Turkey have been terminated; and you may be assured that my attention will be carefully directed to any events which may affect the present state or the future independence of that empire."

I now pass at once to the month of October in the same year. In October M. La Grenée, the French *chargé d'affaires*, addressed a letter to Count Nesselrode of a most remarkable kind. Considering the close junction which subsisted between the courts of St James's and the Tuileries—a junction which I hope still continues—considering the fidelity of that alliance to be mutual—it is hardly too much to look upon this note as if it came from the noble lord himself, sitting in Downing Street. This note of M. La Grenée was written in October, but was not published in Paris till the 23d of December 1833, when it came before the whole of the European public. I pray the particular attention of the House to this note. Our attention has lately been directed to matters of domestic interest and immediate pressure; but be it remembered, that events are now going on which are fraught with consequences which may affect our domestic interests as much as others which only appear larger because more near. The note of M. La Grenée to Count Nesselrode runs thus:

"The undersigned Chargé d'Affaires of his Majesty the King of the French, has received orders to express to the cabinet of St Petersburgh the profound affliction felt by the French Government, on learning the conclusion of the treaty of the 8th of July last, between his Majesty the Emperor of Russia and the Grand Seignior. In the opinion of the king's govern ment, this treaty assigns to the mutual relations existing between the Ottoman empire and Russia a new character, against which the powers of Europe have a right to protest."

To this note, Count Nesselrode replied in the following cant, offensive, and almost contumelious language:

"It is true that this act changes the nature of the relations between Russia and the Porte, for in the room of long-continued hostilities it substitutes that friendship and that confidence, in which the Turkish Government will henceforth find a guarantee for its stability and necessary means of defence, calculated to ensure its preservation, In this conviction, and guided by the purest and most disinterested intentions, his Majesty the Emperor is resolved, in case of necessity, to discharge faithfully the obligations imposed on him by the treaty of the 8th of July, thus acting as if the declaration contained in the note of Monsieur La Grenée had no existence.

"St Petersburgh, October 1833."

This note is taken from the *Augsburgh Gazette*, to which it purports to have been transmitted in a letter from Paris on the 23d of December. Here let one remark be made, which will not trench on the distinct classification of facts. If the French Government remonstrated, it is to be presumed that the noble lord did not remain silent. Where is his correspondence? Was a note as affronting written in reply, or was it even couched in more caustic phraseology, and in the same style of contemptuous repudiation as the article in the *St Petersburgh Gazette*, on the presumption of our interference in the

affairs of Poland? To return to dates and facts —on the 1st of January, Pozzo di Borgo addressed the King of the French, and on that occasion the accomplished Corsican pronounced on Louis Philip an eulogium, accompanied with protestations, characteristic of both—of the party who indulged in, and the party who was graciously pleased to accept the holy panegyric. Six days after, in bringing up the address, M. Bignon delivered a speech, which was received with equal surprise and acclamation. He denounced the conduct of Russia towards Poland, and held out the aggressions upon Turkey as indicative of that deep and settled purpose, of which he had, in his official capacity, a perfect cognisance. In 1807, he said, Alexander had tendered all Southern Europe to Napoleon, provided Napoleon would give him what he called at once in homely, but powerful diction—the key of his own house—Constantinople. That offer was refused; the consequences were foreseen by Napoleon. M. Bignon then warned France to beware of the advances of Russian power in the East, and denounced, while he revealed her policy, and invoked his countrymen to awaken to a sense of the insults offered to the dignity of France, and the violation offered to her rights. To this speech, the Duke de Broglie made an answer conspicuous in itself, and which his subsequent conduct rendered still more remarkable. He expressed his unqualified concurrence in all that had been said, and thanked M. Bignon for having given expression to the sentiments which he and his colleagues entertained. On the very next day, this very man went down to the Chamber, and made a speech which was received with astonishment by both countries. He contended that no violation of treaty had taken place, expressed satisfaction with Russian policy, and stated that there had been no material alteration made respecting the passage of the Dardanelles. M. Thiers, in reply to M. Mauguin, said nearly the same thing; and, although La Grenée's note was yet fresh in every memory, and the Duke of Broglie's approval of Bignon's speech was ringing in every ear, expressed no sort of discontent at any one of the incidents which had taken place. M. Thiers, however, incidentally acknowledged that it was a part of the treaty, that all vessels of powers at war with Russia should be excluded from the passage of the Dardanelles. Our own Parliament did not meet until the 5th of February; but before it assembled an accident occurred which remains to be explained. The French and English fleets united, proceeded to the Dardanelles, which Russia had spared no expense to fortify; and, having displayed the tri-colour, and "the meteor flag of England," as it has been nobly called, near the spot where Sir George Duckworth, when Lord Grey was Secretary for Foreign Affairs, expended a good deal of powder without much avail, both fleets sailed away, and instead of proceeding to Smyrna, gave a preference to a more distant and less commodious harbour, where, however, Russian influence was not quite so predominant as in that celebrated haven. The glory of this expedition belongs to the First Lord of the Admiralty; but it is to be conjectured that the achievement was suggested by the genius of the Secretary for Foreign Affairs. But in what did it result? That remains to be told; and, for the satisfaction of that curiosity, I, this night, afford an opportunity. Parliament met on the 5th. The king's speech informed us that the integrity of the Porte was, for the future, to be preserved (the sultan having been first stripped and then manacled), and that his Majesty continued to receive assurances which did not disturb his confidence that peace would be preserved. The Duke of Wellington, in another place, adverted to the treaty of Constantinople, and Lord Grey retorted Adrianople upon his Grace. But in the treaty of Adrianople there was, at all events, nothing that infringed upon our rights as to the navigation of the Black Sea; and it is to be recollected that whatever the First Lord of the Treasury might have said, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs declared that—"while he desired peace, of war he was not in the least afraid." In this House no interrogatories were put. On the 24th of February the following paragraph appeared in the *Globe*, which, from its being the supposed organ of Government, deserves great attention, the more especially as we are left to the newspapers for our intelligence. That article stated:

"Another treaty between Russia and Turkey has been concluded at St Petersburgh, which was signed by Achmet Pacha on the 29th of last month. . . . Enough has transpired to satisfy the most jealous that its spirit is pacific, and indeed advantageous to the Turkish empire. The Porte is relieved from the pressure of the engagements imposed upon her at Adrianople; and we understand that the principalities, with the exception of Silistria, will shortly be evacuated, and the sum exacted by the former treaty reduced one-third. Such relaxations of positive engagements are proofs either of the moderation and good sense of Russia, or of the influence which the union of England and France, and the firm and concerted language of those two powers, have acquired in the councils of St Petersburgh."

Is it not reasonable that this treaty should be laid before the House? It is to be observed, that in any account of it, either in our journals or in the *Algemeine Zeitung*, not one word is said of the passage of the Dardanelles. The principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia, indeed, are to be evacuated. That circumstance is a mere delusion; for Wallachia and Moldavia are as much dependent on Russia as if they had actually been transferred. Their hospodars are virtually nominated by Russia; no Turk can

reside in the country; and every appointment, down to that of the humblest officer, is effected through Russian dictation. Silistria is retained —the key of the Lower Danube, commanding all Bulgaria, and a place so important, that the Greek emperors constructed a wall there to protect their frontier, and guard against the incursions of the barbarians. As to the remission of money, that concession is made to an insolvent debtor; it is not the first time that Russia has adopted the same course; the payment of a tribute is of little moment from a country which is almost incorporated in her dominions, and will soon meet the fate of so many of the Turkish provinces. But how does this treaty modify or affect that of the 8th of July? It does not at all relate to it. It concerns the treaty of Adrianople; and as long as we have nothing else on this question, the House is entitled to receive adequate information from the Government. With respect to the Dardanelles, a matter of signal importance to England—affecting her commerce—affecting not only the navigation of the Euxine, but giving Russia a control over Greece and the entire Archipelago—it may be as well to state with brevity the treaties that existed between England and Turkey, and those that existed between Russia and Turkey, previous to that regarding which information is demanded. I will not go back to the reign of Elizabeth. By the treaty of 1675, concluded by Sir John Finch, the navigation of all the Turkish seas was secured to England. In 1809, a little time after our rupture with the Porte, produced by the attack on the Dardanelles, a new treaty was executed, by which the passage of the Dardanelles and the canal of Constantinople was secured to England. The 11th article provided, that in time of peace no ship of war should pass, no matter to what country it might belong. In 1774, by the treaty of Kaynadgi, the passage of the Dardanelles was first secured to Russian merchant vessels. In 1780 a quarrel took place respecting an armed vessel. In 1783 a new treaty was entered into, and another in 1792 (that treaty by which the Crimea, just like Greece, was declared independent, and then absorbed in Russian domination), and by both treaties the passage was secured to merchant vessels only.

In 1800 Russia, having obtained the protectorship of the Ionian Islands (their importance we felt in 1815, not so much because we desired to acquire, as to take them from a power that aimed at predominance in the Mediterranean), entered into a treaty, securing the passage to the merchant vessels of the islands. In 1812 the treaty of Bucharest was signed, by which Bessarabia was given up to Russia, and all former treaties respecting the Dardanelles were confirmed. In 1829 the treaty of Adrianople was signed, and with respect to the Dardanelles, contained the following passage:

"7th Article.—The Sublime Porte declares the passage of the canal of Constantinople completely free and open to Russian merchant vessels under merchant flags, from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean, and from the Mediterranean to the Black Sea; upon the same principle the passage is declared free and open to all merchant vessels belonging to powers at peace with the Porte. The Porte declares, that under no pretence whatsoever will it throw any obstacle in the way of the exercise of this right, and engages, above all, never hereafter to stop or detain vessels, either with cargo or in ballast, whether Russian, or belonging to nations with which the Porte shall not be in a state of declared war."

In the manifesto, published by the Emperor Nicholas, on the 1st of October 1829, he says:

"The passage of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus is henceforth free and open to the commerce of all the nations of the world."

Thus the stipulation was, that all nations at peace (not, be it observed, with Russia, but with the Porte) should enjoy the right of unimpeded passage; but how has that been effected by the treaty of the 8th of July? Will it be said that nothing was accomplished by the Autocrat by that treaty? If so, why was it signed without the knowledge of our ambassador, and in a clandestine and surreptitious way? What are its provisions? Do the public journals give a just account of it? Is it true that it provides that no vessels belonging to a power at war with Russia shall enjoy that right? If so, the alteration is palpable; and if there be no express declaration to this effect, let there be an alliance, offensive and defensive, and the Porte is bound to consider every enemy of Russia as its own; the consequence is precisely the same as if the Porte surrendered to Russia the possession of the Dardanelles, and the last of the sultans is the first satrap of Nicholas the Great.

There does not appear to be any sound reason for withholding this treaty. It has been the subject of remonstrance by France—of debate in the French Chamber—of diversified commentary in the public journals. Why withhold it? There must be a strange inconsistency in publishing all the enormous answers to protocols respecting Belgium, where the transaction is as yet incomplete, and in refusing to furnish anything but materials for surmise on this treaty. Ponderous folios of fruitless negotiati ns on the affairs of Belgium have been given to the world. Let the Government act upon the principle adopted in that case, and give the English people the means of forming a judgment of the policy which his Majesty's ministers have adopted in a question where the national honour and interest are so deeply involved. It may be said, "Trust in the minister, be sure that he will not desert his duty, or acquiesce in any measure incompatible with the honour of Eng-

land." I should be disposed to do so, when I take into account that the Secretary for Foreign Affairs was a political follower of Mr Canning, who considered the interests and the honour of England as so closely blended, and although the noble lord may have abandoned the opinions on domestic policy which were entertained by Mr Canning where he was in the wrong, it is to be presumed that he adhered with a closer tenacity to those opinions in foreign policy where Mr Canning was in the right. But this ground of confidence in the noble lord is modified, if not countervailed, by the recollection, that in many recent transactions he has been baffled by that power which has gathered all the profligate nobility of Europe together, in order to compound a cabinet of Machiavellian mercenaries to maintain the cause of slavery through the world. Look at Belgium—look at the Russian-Dutch loan. The noble lord, although guided by the Prince of Benevento, has lost his way in the labyrinth which Russia has prepared for him and Poland. "We shall," he exclaimed, "remonstrate." We did remonstrate, and despatched Lord Durham to St Petersburgh (why was not Sir Stratford Canning there?), and what has been the result? If confidence be to be entertained in the noble lord, it must be built on some firmer basis than his entertainment of the treaty of Vienna. Instead of calling on the people of England to confide in him, let him build his confidence in the English people. They are attached to peace, but they are not afraid of war. Our fleet could blow the Russian navy from the ocean. England is yet a match for the Northern Autocrat, and there is might enough left in her arm to shatter the colossus that bestrides the sea by which Europe is divided from Asia, and which has been accounted from time beyond record one of the demarcations of the world.

EARL OF DERBY.

1799-1869.

THE DISSOLUTION OF PARLIAMENT.

[FROM the conclusion of a speech in the House of Lords, on the 4th April 1859, when Parliament was dissolved.]

When the vote passed in the other House, my colleagues and myself were fully and unanimously of opinion that there were only two alternatives which it was possible for us to select, viz., to take upon ourselves the responsibility of advising her Majesty to dissolve Parliament, as soon as it could be done consistently with the discharge of those duties and the performance of that amount of business which is indispensable before a dissolution can take place, and thereby making an appeal to the deliberate opinion of the country; or, in the second place, to offer her Majesty our gratitude for past favours, and with a deep sense of her Majesty's kindness and confidence, humbly and dutifully to tender to her Majesty the resignation of our offices. My Lords, we carefully considered these two alternatives, and I can assure your Lordships that—if we had considered anything but the imperative calls of duty—if we had not been prepared to sacrifice our private convenience to the public interests, there was not one of my colleagues who would not, with me, joyfully accepted the alternative I have pointed out—who would not have embraced with satisfaction the opportunity of relieving himself from the cares, labours, and responsibilities of office, and who would not have contentedly withdrawn into the retirement of private life.

My Lords, the interests at stake were too great to permit us to consider our private feelings and personal conveniences. There was the critical state of affairs abroad as well as at home, and . . . I believe that the preservation of the public peace of Europe, if it is still to be maintained, will be seriously endangered by any change in the present composition of her Majesty's Government. My Lords, I speak this not boastfully as to myself and my colleagues, but I know that there is no country in Europe in which the lovers of peace do not look with serious apprehensions to the overthrow of the present Government and the substitution of a government presided over either by the noble viscount the member for Tiverton, or the noble lord the member for the city of London. My Lords, we are not insensible to the inconvenience of a dissolution at the present moment, to the delay which it will cause in the conduct of public business, to the various evils which are inseparable from a dissolution of Parliament at this season of the year; but, believing that it is essential that the country should have an opportunity of pronouncing an opinion, and of applying, at the earliest possible opportunity, a remedy for the present unsatisfactory state of things, we thought it our duty respectfully to tender our advice to her Majesty that she would be pleased to sanction as early a dissolution of Parliament as shall be compatible with the state of public

ousiness; and, if her Majesty should not be pleased to approve of that suggestion, we humbly and unanimously tendered to her Majesty the resignation of the offices we held. Though not insensible to the inconvenience of either course, her Majesty graciously intimated her pleasure that we should continue to hold our offices, and her Majesty sanctioned an appeal to be made to the judgment and decision of the people.

My Lords, to that appeal I look with confidence. But the country will greatly mistake the character of that appeal if it supposes that the question which is submitted to it is, whether this or that measure of reform should be adopted, and whether this or that clause or provision should be inserted in the bill. We have redeemed our pledge to propose to Parliament what we thought would have satisfied the reasonable expectations of the House of Commons, and would have shown the conciliatory spirit in which we undertook the question. But, my Lords, after the vote of the House of Commons on this subject we hold ourselves free from the provisions of that bill, and free to reconsider the whole question anew, without prejudice and with due deliberation. The course adopted by the other House on the motion of the noble lord the member for the city of London [Lord John Russell] will have this effect, that no single member of that House, who may be unconnected with office, will be by his vote pledged to one single provision of that measure. The principles and details of any new bill will be as open to consideration and deliberation as they were before our measure was submitted to Parliament. I know some of my friends in the House of Commons have been threatened that, if they go to the hustings, they must go with this bill round their necks, and they have been defied in such a case to meet a popular constituency. I say nothing about the hustings, because that is not a place where calm deliberation always prevails, but where passion and clamour often carry the day. But I am satisfied that, where any constituency will calmly and fairly consider the merits and demerits of that measure, they will be of opinion the bill we offered was a large, liberal, and useful measure of reform, and one which, while largely extending the advantages of the franchise and admitting many of the lower classes, yet did not indiscriminately admit such a number as to overbear all other classes, and enable the lower classes to monopolise the representation. The House of Commons, however, has thought fit to prohibit the discussion of that measure. The amendment of the noble lord will have the effect of postponing for another year the settlement of the question of reform. It will have the effect of creating serious inconvenience to the public interests by the interruption of useful and necessary legislative measures, by the check it will give to commercial speculation, by apprehensions of the possible consequences of a change of ministry, and of danger to the peace of Europe. I know all this; and I know, too, that the vote which the House of Commons has pronounced will not have the effect, in the slightest degree, of establishing any principle of parliamentary reform.

My Lords, we do not appeal to the country on the subject of parliamentary reform, still less do we appeal to the country on the particular provisions of that bill. We appeal to the country on a much larger and broader question—whether the present state of the House of Commons—split up as it is into hundreds of petty parties, any one of which is unable to conduct the business of the country, but which are able, by combining together, to obstruct any government that may be formed—shall receive the continued support and confidence of the people of England? We appeal to them as men who have endeavoured faithfully to discharge the duties of our office, who have endeavoured to deserve the confidence which the House of Commons has withheld, and the confidence which our sovereign has been pleased to renew in us; we appeal to them to know whether they will entrust the preparation of a measure of reform to those who would approach it in a calm and deliberate spirit, and discuss it in a moderate and temperate tone, or whether they would entrust the preparation of such a measure to men who have embarked upon the wild and visionary schemes of the honourable member for Birmingham, and the hardly less dangerous and visionary propositions of the right honourable gentleman the member for Carlisle, the partner of the noble lord in concocting this resolution. We appeal to them whether, as lovers of fair dealing, and plain and straightforward conduct in public men, they would sanction the overthrow of a ministry who, in honourably endeavouring to discharge their duty, have fallen, not in pursuance of a difference of opinion brought forward in fair parliamentary conflict, but who have been overthrown in consequence of the success—the undeserved, but I will not call it the unanticipated success—of what, not to use an offensive expression, I will term an ingenious manœuvre.

LORD MACAULAY.

1800-1859.

ON COPYRIGHT.

[FROM a speech delivered in a committee of the House of Commons, April 6, 1842. On 3d March 1842 Lord Mahon obtained permission to bring in a bill to amend the law of copyright. By its provisions copyright was extended to the term of twenty-five years from the death of an author. The plan suggested by Lord Macaulay in his speech was, with some slight alterations, adopted. Dr J. G. Holland, in speaking of the necessity of a copyright law between England and America, lays down very clearly in what a copyright really consists: "If there is anything to which a man has a right, it is to that which he creates, or that which his culture and labour bring into fresh combinations for the use of the world. The first factor in the value of a book is its authorship. The first man who does any work upon a book is the author. The question of publication depends, or is supposed to depend, upon the quality of that work. Until the author is fairly paid for his work, no man—publisher or reader—has a right to appropriate it any more than he has a right to steal a sixpence from a neighbour's pocket. . . . The primary, vital value of every book is given to it by its author, and this, in equity, he never alienates. He should be able to win a return for his value from every man all over the world who chooses to purchase the volume that conveys it."]

The present state of the law is this. The author of a work has a certain copyright in that work for a term of twenty-eight years. If he should live more than twenty-eight years after the publication of the work, he retains the copyright to the end of his life.

My noble friend does not propose to make any addition to the term of twenty-eight years. But he proposes that the copyright shall last twenty-five years after the author's death. Thus my noble friend makes no addition to that term which is certain, but makes a very large addition to that term which is uncertain.

My plan is different. I would make no addition to the uncertain term; but I would make a large addition to the certain term. I propose to add fourteen years to the twenty-eight years which the law now allows to an author. His copyright will, in this way, last till his death, or till the expiration of forty-two years, whichever shall first happen. And I think that I shall be able to prove to the satisfaction of the committee that my plan will be more beneficial to literature and to literary men than the plan of my noble friend.

It must surely, sir, be admitted that the protection which we give to books ought to be distributed as evenly as possible, that every book should have a fair share of that protection, and no book more than a fair share. It would evidently be absurd to put tickets into a wheel, with different numbers marked upon them, and to make writers draw, one a term of twenty-eight years, another a term of fifty, another a term of ninety. And yet this sort of lottery is what my noble friend proposes to establish. I know that we cannot altogether exclude chance. You have two terms of copyright; one certain, the other uncertain; and we cannot, I admit, get rid of the uncertain term. It is proper, no doubt, that an author's copyright should last during his life. But, sir, though we cannot altogether exclude chance, we can very much diminish the share which chance must have in distributing the recompense which we wish to give to genius and learning. By every addition which we make to the certain term we diminish the influence of chance; by every addition which we make to the uncertain term we increase the influence of chance. I shall make myself best understood by putting cases. Take two eminent female writers, who died within our own memory, Madame D'Arblay and Miss Austen. As the law now stands, Miss Austen's charming novels would have only from twenty-eight to thirty-three years of copyright. For that extraordinary woman died young: she died before her genius was fully appreciated by the world. Madame D'Arblay outlived the whole generation to which she belonged. The copyright of her celebrated novel "Evelina" lasted, under the present law, sixty-two years. Surely this inequality is sufficiently great—sixty-two years of copyright for "Evelina," only twenty-eight for "Persuasion." But to my noble friend this inequality seems not great enough. He proposes to add twenty-five years to Madame D'Arblay's term, and not a single day to Miss Austen's term. He would give to "Persuasion" a copyright of only twenty-eight years, as at present, and to "Evelina" a copyright more than three times as long—a copyright of eighty-seven years. Now, is this reasonable? See, on the other hand, the operation of my plan. I make no addition at all to Madame D'Arblay's term of sixty-two years, which is, in my opinion, quite long enough; but I extend Miss Austen's term to forty-two years, which is,

Sri Pratap College Library.

in my opinion, not too much. You see, sir, that at present, chance has too much sway in this matter; that at present the protection which the state gives to letters is very unequally given. You see that if my noble friend's plan be adopted, more will be left to chance than under the present system, and you will have such inequalities as are unknown under the present system. You see also that, under the system which I recommend, we shall have, not perfect certainty, not perfect equality, but much less uncertainty and inequality than at present.

But this is not all. My noble friend's plan is not merely to institute a lottery in which some writers will draw prizes and some will draw blanks. It is much worse than this. His lottery is so contrived that, in the vast majority of cases, the blanks will fall to the best books, and the prizes to books of inferior merit.

Take Shakespeare. My noble friend gives a longer protection than I should give to "Love's Labour's Lost," and "Pericles, Prince of Tyre;" but he gives a shorter protection than I should give to "Othello" and "Macbeth."

Take Milton. Milton died in 1674. The copyrights of Milton's great works would, according to my noble friend's plan, expire in 1699. "Comus" appeared in 1634, the "Paradise Lost" in 1668. To "Comus," then, my noble friend would give sixty-five years of copyright, and to the "Paradise Lost" only thirty-one years. Is that reasonable? "Comus" is a noble poem: but who would rank it with the "Paradise Lost?" My plan would give forty-two years both to the "Paradise Lost" and to "Comus."

Let us pass on from Milton to Dryden. My noble friend would give more than sixty years of copyright to Dryden's worst works; to the encomiastic verses on "Oliver Cromwell," to the "Wild Gallant," to the "Rival Ladies," to other wretched pieces as bad as anything written by Flecknoe or Settle· but for "Theodore and Honoria," for "Tancred and Sigismunda," for "Cimon and Iphigenia," for "Palamon and Arcite," for "Alexander's Feast," my noble friend thinks a copyright of twenty-eight years sufficient. Of all Pope's works, that to which my noble friend would give the largest measure of protection is the volume of pastorals, remarkable only as the production of a boy. Johnson's first work was a translation of a "Book of Travels in Abyssinia," published in 1735. It was so poorly executed that in his later years he did not like to hear it mentioned. Boswell once picked up a copy of it, and told his friend that he had done so. "Do not talk about it," said Johnson: "it is a thing to be forgotten." To this performance my noble friend would give protection during the enormous term of seventy-five years. To the "Lives of the Poets" he would give protection during about thirty years. Well; take Henry Fielding; it matters not whom I take, but take Fielding. His early works are read only by the curious, and would not be read even by the curious, but for the fame which he acquired in the later part of his life by works of a very different kind. What is the value of the "Temple Beau," of the "Intriguing Chambermaid," of half-a-dozen other plays of which few gentlemen have even heard the names? Yet to these worthless pieces my noble friend would give a term of copyright longer by more than twenty years than that which he would give to "Tom Jones" and "Amelia."

Go on to Burke. His little tract, entitled "The Vindication of Natural Society," is certainly not without merit; but it would not be remembered in our days if it did not bear the name of Burke. To this tract my noble friend would give a copyright of near seventy years. But to the great work on the French Revolution, to the "Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs," to the letters on the Regicide Peace, he would give a copyright of thirty years, or little more.

And, sir, observe that I am not selecting here and there extraordinary instances in order to make up the semblance of a case. I am taking the greatest names of our literature in chronological order. Go to other nations; go to remote ages; you will still find the general rule the same. There was no copyright at Athens or Rome; but the history of the Greek and Latin literature illustrates my argument quite as well as if copyright had existed in ancient times. Of all the plays of Sophocles, the one to which the plan of my noble friend would have given the most scanty recompense would have been that wonderful masterpiece, the "Œdipus at Colonos." Who would class together the "Speech of Demosthenes against his Guardians" and the "Speech for the Crown?" My noble friend, indeed, would not class them together. For to the "Speech against the Guardians" he would give a copyright of near seventy years; and to the incomparable "Speech for the Crown" a copyright of less than half that length. Go to Rome. My noble friend would give more than twice as long a term to Cicero's juvenile declamation in defence of Roscius Amerinus as to the "Second Philippic." Go to France; my noble friend would give a far longer term to Racine's "Frères Ennemis" than to "Athalie," and to Molière's "Etourdi" than to "Tartuffe." Go to Spain. My noble friend would give a longer term to forgotten works of Cervantes, works which nobody now reads, than to "Don Quixote." Go to Germany. According to my noble friend's plan, of all the works of Schiller, the "Robbers" would be the most favoured: of all the works of Goethe, the "Sorrows of Werter" would be the most favoured. I thank the committee for listening so kindly to this long enumeration. Gentlemen will perceive, I am sure, that it is not from pedantry that I mention the names of so many books and

authors. But just as, in our debates on civil affairs, we constantly draw illustrations from civil history, we must, in a debate about literary property, draw our illustrations from literary history. Now, sir, I have, I think, shown from literary history that the effect of my noble friend's plan would be to give to crude and imperfect works, to third-rate and fourth-rate works, a great advantage over the highest productions of genius. It is impossible to account for the facts which I have laid before you by attributing them to mere accident. Their number is too great, their character too uniform. We must seek for some other explanation; and we shall easily find one.

It is the law of our nature that the mind shall attain its full power by slow degrees, and this is especially true of the most vigorous minds. Young men, no doubt, have often produced works of great merit; but it would be impossible to name any writer of the first order whose juvenile performances were his best. That all the most valuable books of history, of philology, of physical and metaphysical science, of divinity, of political economy, have been produced by men of mature years, will hardly be disputed. The case may not be quite so clear as respects works of the imagination. And yet I know no work of the imagination of the very highest class that was ever, in any age or country, produced by a man under thirty-five. Whatever powers a youth may have received from nature, it is impossible that his taste and judgment can be ripe, that his mind can be richly stored with images, that he can have observed the vicissitudes of life, that he can have studied the nicer shades of character. How, as Marmontel very sensibly said, is a person to paint portraits who has never seen faces? On the whole, I believe that I may without fear of contradiction, affirm this, that of the good books now extant in the world, more than nineteen-twentieths were published after the writers had attained the age of forty. If this be so, it is evident that the plan of my noble friend is framed on a vicious principle. For, while he gives to juvenile productions a very much larger protection than they now enjoy, he does comparatively little for the works of men in the full maturity of their powers, and absolutely nothing for any work which is published during the last three years of the life of the writer. For, by the existing law, the copyright of such a work lasts twenty-eight years from the publication; and my noble friend gives only twenty-five years, to be reckoned from the writer's death.

What I recommend is that the certain term, reckoned from the date of publication, shall be forty-two years instead of twenty-eight years. In this arrangement there is no uncertainty, no inequality. The advantage which I propose to give will be the same to every book. No work will have so long a copyright as my noble friend gives to some books, or so short a copyright as he gives to others. No copyright will last ninety years. No copyright will end in twenty-eight years. To every book published in the course of the last seventeen years of a writer's life I give a longer term of copyright than my noble friend gives; and I am confident that no person versed in literary history will deny this—that in general the most valuable works of an author are published in the course of the last seventeen years of his life. I will rapidly enumerate a few, and but a few, of the great works of English writers to which my plan is more favourable than my noble friend's plan. To "Lear," to "Macbeth," to "Othello," to the "Fairy Queen," to the "Paradise Lost," to Bacon's "Novum Organum" and "De Augmentis," to Locke's "Essay on the Human Understanding," to Clarendon's "History," to Hume's "History," to Gibbon's "History," to Smith's "Wealth of Nations," to Addison's "Spectators," to almost all the great works of Burke, to "Clarissa," and "Sir Charles Grandison," to "Joseph Andrews," "Tom Jones," and "Amelia," and, with the single exception of "Waverley," to all the novels of Sir Walter Scott, I give a longer term of copyright than my noble friend gives. Can he match that list? Does not that list contain what England has produced greatest in many various ways—poetry, philosophy, history, eloquence, wit, skilful portraiture of life and manners? I confidently, therefore, call on the committee to take my plan in preference to the plan of my noble friend. I have shown that the protection which he proposes to give to letters is unequal, and unequal in the worst way. I have shown that his plan is to give protection to books in inverse proportion to their merit. I shall move, when we come to the third clause of the bill, to omit the words "twenty-five years," and in a subsequent part of the same clause I shall move to substitute for the words "twenty-eight years," the words "forty-two years." I earnestly hope that the committee will adopt these amendments; and I feel the firmest conviction that my noble friend's bill, so amended, will confer a great boon on men of letters, with the smallest possible inconvenience to the public.

REV. THOMAS GUTHRIE, D.D.

1803-1873.

THE CITY, ITS SINS AND SORROWS.*

THERE is a remarkable phenomenon to be seen on certain parts of our coast. Strange to say, it proves, notwithstanding such expressions as the stable and solid land, that it is not the land but the sea which is the stable element. On some summer day, when there is not a wave to rock her, nor breath of wind to fill her sail or fan a cheek, you launch your boat upon the waters, and, pulling out beyond lowest tide mark, you idly lie upon her bows to catch the silvery glance of a passing fish, or watch the movements of the many curious creatures that travel the sea's sandy bed, or creeping out of their rocky homes, wander its tangled mazes. If the traveller is surprised to find a deep-sea shell embedded in the marbles of a mountain peak, how great is your surprise to see beneath you a vegetation foreign to the deep! Below your boat, submerged many feet beneath the surface of the lowest tide, away down in these green crystal depths, you see no rusting anchor, no mouldering remains of some shipwrecked one, but in the standing stumps of trees the mouldering vestiges of a forest, where once the wild cat prowled, and the birds of heaven, singing their loves, had nestled and nursed their young. In counterpart to those portions of our coast where sea-hollowed caves, with sides the waves have polished, and floors still strewed with shells and sand, now stand high above the level of strongest stream-tides, there stand these dead decaying trees—entombed in the deep. A strange phenomenon, which admits of no other explanation than this, that there the coast line has sunk beneath its ancient level.

Many of our cities present a phenomenon as melancholy to the eye of a philanthropist, as the other is interesting to a philosopher, or geologist. In their economical, educational, moral, and religious aspects, certain parts of this city bear palpable evidence of a corresponding subsidence. Not a single house, nor a block of houses, but whole streets, once from end to end the homes of decency, and industry, and wealth, and rank, and piety, have been engulphed. A flood of ignorance, and misery, and sin, now breaks and roars above the top of their highest tenements. Nor do the old stumps of a forest, still standing up erect beneath the sea-wave, indicate a greater change, a deeper subsidence, than the relics of ancient grandeur, and the touching memorials of piety which yet linger about these wretched dwellings, like evening twilight on the hills—like some traces of beauty on a corpse. The unfurnished floor, the begrimed and naked walls, the stifling, sickening atmosphere, the patched and dusty window—through which a sunbeam, like hope, is faintly stealing, the ragged, hunger-bitten, and sad-faced children, the ruffian man, the heap of straw where some wretched mother, in muttering dreams, sleeps off last night's debauch, or lies unshrouded and uncoffined in the ghastliness of a hopeless death, are sad scenes. We have often looked on them. And they appear all the sadder for the restless play of fancy. Excited by some vestiges of a fresco-painting that still looks out from the foul and broken plaster, the massive marble rising over the cold and cracked hearth-stone, an elaborately carved cornice too high for shivering cold to pull it down for fuel, some stucco flowers or fruit yet pendant on the crumbling ceiling, fancy, kindled by these, calls up the gay scenes and actors of other days—when beauty, elegance, and fashion graced these lonely halls, and plenty smoked on groaning tables; and where these few cinders, gathered from the city dust-heap, are feebly smouldering, hospitable fires roared up the chimney.

But there is that in and about these houses which bears witness of a deeper subsidence, a yet sadder change. Bent on some mission of mercy, you stand at the foot of a dank and filthy stair. It conducts you to the crowded rooms of a tenement, where—with the exception of some old decent widow who has seen better days, and when her family are all dead, and her friends are all gone, still clings to God and her faith in the dark hour of adversity and amid the wreck of fortune—from the cellar-dens below to the cold garrets beneath the roof-tree, you shall find none either reading their Bible, or even with a Bible to read. Alas! of prayer, of morning or evening psalms, of earthly or heavenly peace, it may be said the place that once knew them knows them no more. But before you enter the door-way, raise your eyes to the lintel-stone. Dumb, it yet speaks of other and better times. Carved in Greek or Latin, or our own mother tongue, you decipher such texts as these: "Peace be to this house;" "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it;" "We have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens;" "Fear God;" or this, "Love your neighbour." Like the mouldering remnants of a forest that once resounded with the

---

"When He beheld the city, He wept over it" (Luke xix. 41).

melody of birds, but hears nought now save the the angry dash or melancholy moan of breaking waves, these vestiges of piety furnish a gauge which enables us to measure how low in these dark localities the whole stratum of society has sunk.

Now there are forces in nature which, heaving up the crust of our earth, may convert that sea-bed again into forest or corn land. At this moment these forces are in active operation. Working slowly, yet with prodigious power, they are raising the coasts of Sweden in the old world and of Chili in the new. And who knows but that these subterranean agencies, elevating our own coasts, may yet restore verdure to those deep sea sands—giving back to the plough its soil, to waving pines their forest land. And thus on our shores, redeemed from the grasp of the ocean in some future era, golden harvests may fall to the reaper's song, and tall forests to the woodman's axe. We know not whether this shall happen. But I do know, that there is a force at work in this world—gentle, yet powerful—commonly slow in action, but always sure in its results, which, mightier than volcanic fires, pent-up vapour, or rocking earthquake, is adequate to raise the most sunken masses of society, and restore the lowest and longest neglected districts of our cities to their old level—to set them on the platform even of a higher Christianity.

Can these people ever be raised? Can those "dry bones live?" "Where is the Lord God of Elijah?" are questions, distressing questions, which, when worn and weary, and disappointed, and cast down, and heart-sick, we have been often tempted to ask. Of such times, we could say with David: "We had fainted, unless we had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living." But this voice of God came sounding down from heaven, saying: "Though ye have lain among the pots, yet ye shall be as the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her feathers with yellow gold." When ready to sink under a sense of our own feebleness, it said to us: "The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels; the Lord is among them, as in Sinai, in the holy place." To the question, Can these lost ones be recovered? the answer came in these brave, and bold, and cheerful terms: "I will bring again from Bashan; I will bring my people again from the depths of the sea, that thy foot may be dipped in the blood of thine enemies, and the tongue of thy dogs in the same." And as he stood on the heights of inspiration, looking far away into distant time, and commanding an extent of prospect hid from common eyes, we have heard the prophet announce the approaching of the promised event, this glorious Gospel change: "They have seen thy goings, O God; even the goings of my King in the sanctuary. The singers went before, the players on instruments followed after; among them were the damsels playing on timbrels. There is little Benjamin with the ruler, the princes of Judah with their council, the princes of Zebulon and the princes of Naphtali. Thy God hath commanded thy strength. Strengthen, O God, that which Thou hast wrought for us. Sing unto God, ye kingdoms of the earth, O sing praises unto the Lord."

Yes. To infuse new vigour into his sinking energies, a man has only to "remember the years of the right hand of the Most High." How does the Gospel of Jesus Christ, crowned with triumphs, point her sceptre not to families, nor hamlets, nor cities, but whole nations, raised from the lowest barbarism and the basest vices!

We cannot despair so long as we do not forget, that the power of God, and the wisdom of God, and the grace of God, have nothing to do within our shores which they have not done already. Are our lapsed classes rude and uncultivated, ignorant and vicious? So were our forefathers, when Christianity landed on this island. She took possession of it in Jesus' name, and conquered bold savages, whom the Romans could never subdue, by the mild yet mighty power of the Gospel. God's "hand is not shortened that it cannot save, nor is His ear heavy that it cannot hear." Therefore, whatever length of time may be required to evangelise our city masses, however long we may be living before the period when "a nation shall be born in a day," whatever trials of patience we may have to endure, whatever tears we may have to shed over our cities, our tears are not such as Jesus wept, when He beheld Jerusalem.

No. Jerusalem was sealed to ruin—doomed beyond redemption. Our brethren, our cities, are not so. We have not to mourn as those who have no hope. As on a summer day I have seen the sky at once so shine and shower, that every rain-drop was changed by sunbeams into a falling diamond, so hopes mingle here with fears, and the promises of the Gospel shed sunlight on pious sorrows. Weep we may; weep we should—weep and work, weep and pray. But ever let our tears be such as were shed by Jesus beside the tomb of Lazarus, when, while groaning, weeping, He bade the bystanders roll away the stone—anticipating the moment when the grave at His command would give up its dead, and Lazarus be folded, a living brother, in the arms that, four days ago, had swathed his corpse. Be such our tears. Sustained by such anticipations, we shall work all the better; and all the sooner shall our heavenly Father receive to His embraces the most wretched of these wretched outcasts. Faith may be cast down, but faith cannot be destroyed. There is no reason, because we are "perplexed," ever to "despair." For dark as the cloud looks, it presents one aspect to the world, and another to

the Christian. I stand on the side of it that lies next the sun. There, with the sun shining at my back and the black cloud in my eye, I see a radiant bow which spans its darkness, and reveals in heavenly colours mercy to a fallen world. "It is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners." With the eye of faith fixed on that, we resume our work, and proceed still further to lay bare the state of the city—its sorrows for Christian balm, its sins for Christian cure.

We have turned your attention to the extent of intemperance, let us now,

II. Attend to the effects of this vice.

The Spartans, a brave, and, although heathens, in many respects a virtuous people, held intemperance in the deepest abhorrence. When Christian parents initiate their children in drinking habits, and—as we have seen and wondered at—teach them to carry their glass to infant lips, copy whom they may, the wise old Spartans are not their model. They were not more careful to train the youth of their country to athletic exercises, and from their boyhood and almost their mothers' breasts, to "endure hardship as good soldiers" of Sparta, than to rear them up in habits of strictest, sternest temperance. It formed a regular branch of their national education. Why should it not of ours? It would be an incalculable blessing to the community. It would do incalculably more to promote domestic comfort, to guard the welfare of families, and secure the public good, than other branches of learning that, while they go to improve the taste and polish the mind, put no real pith or power into the man. Well, once a year these Greeks assembled their slaves, and, having compelled them to drink to intoxication, they turned them out—all reeling, staggering, besotted, brutalised—into a great arena, that the youths who filled its benches might go home from this spectacle of degradation to shun the wine cup, and cultivate the virtues of sobriety. Happy country! thrice happy land! where drunkenness was to be seen but once a year, and formed but an annual spectacle. Alas! we have no need to employ such unjustifiable means even for so good an end! We do not require to get up any annual show, from the pulpit to tell, or on the stage of a theatre to represent, its accursed, and direful, and disgusting effects. The lion is daily ravaging on our streets. He goes about "seeking whom he may devour."

Once a year, indeed, when church courts meet, our city may present a spectacle which fools regard with indifference, but wise men with compassion and fear. A pale and haggard man, bearing the title of "Reverend," stands at the bar of his church. Not daring to look up, he bends there with his head buried in his hands, blushes on his face, his lips quivering, and a hell raging, burning within him, as he thinks of home, a broken-hearted wife, and the little ones so soon to leave that dear sweet home, to shelter their innocent heads where best, all beggared and disgraced, they may. "Ah, my brother" there! And ah, my brethren here, learn to "watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation." See there the issue of all a mother's hopes, and a father's self-denying and noble toil, to educate their promising, studious boy. In this deep darkness has set for ever a brilliant college career. Alas! what an end to the solemn day of ordination, and the bright day of marriage, and all those Sabbaths when an affectionate people hung on his eloquent lips! Oh! if this sacred office, if the constant handling of things divine, if hours of silent study spent over the Word of God, if frequent scenes of death, with their most awful and sobering solemnities, if the irremediable ruin into which degradation from the holy office plunges a man and his house along with him, if the unspeakable heinousness of this sin in one who held the post of a sentinel, and was charged with the care of souls—if these do not fortify and fence us against success, then, in the name of God, "let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." You are confident in your strength, so was he. You can use without abusing, so once could he. I tell you I have seen ministers of the Gospel charged by fame, dragged to the bar of their church, and degraded before the world as drunkards, whom once I would have as little expected to fall as I expect some of you—as you believe it possible that this vice shall yet degrade me from the pulpit, and cause my children to blush at mention of their father's name. Such cases are trumpet-tongued. Their voice sounds the loudest warning. In every such fall we hear the crash of a stately tree. Leave an ungodly world—deaf, stone-deaf to the voice of Providence—to quaff their cups, and make the fall of ministers "the song of drunkards;" leave them to say that all religion is hypocrisy, and see, in such a case, but the dropping of a mask from falsehood's face. Let that which emboldens them in sin teach you to stand in awe. For, when a minister of religion falls, it seems to me as if the old prophet, disturbed in his grave by the shock of such an event, had wrapped himself like Samuel in his mantle-shroud, and left the dead to cry in your ears, "Howl, fir-trees, for the cedar is fallen."

On leaving a church court, where he has seen so strange and dreadful a spectacle as a man of cultivated mind, a man of literary habits, a man of honourable position, a man of sacred character, sacrifice all—the cause of religion, the bread of his family, the interests of his children, the happiness of his wife, his character, his soul—all to this base indulgence, who after such a terrible proof of the might and mastery of this tyrant vice, will be astonished at anything he may encounter in our streets? Yet if

the soul of Paul was "stirred within him," when he saw the idolatry of Athens—stirred to its deepest depths—I think that he who can walk from this neighbouring castle to yonder palace, nor groan in spirit, must have a heart about as hard as the pavement that he walks on. The degradation of humanity, the ragged poverty, the squalid misery, the suffering childhood, the pining, dying infancy, oh, how do these obliterate all the romance of the scene, and make the most picturesque street in Christendom one of the most painful to travel. They call the street in Jerusalem, along which tradition says that a bleeding Saviour bore His cross, the *Via Dolorosa;* and I have thought that our own street was baptized in the sorrows of as mournful a name. With so many countenances that have misery stamped on them as plain as if it were burned in with a red-hot iron—hunger staring at us out of these hollow eyes—drink-palsied men, drink-blotched and bloated women—sad and sallow infants who pine away into slow death, with their weary heads lying so pitifully on the shoulders of some half dehumanised woman—this poor little child, who never smiles, without shoe or stocking on his ulcered feet, shivering, creeping, limping along with the bottle in his emaciated hand, to buy a parent drink with the few pence that, poor hungry creature, he would fain spend on a loaf of bread, but dare not—the whole scene is like the roll of the prophet, "written within and without, lamentations, mourning, and woe." How has it wrung our heart to see a ragged famished boy looking greedily in at a window on the food he has no one to give him, and dare not touch—to watch him, as he alternately lifted his naked feet, lest they should freeze to the icy pavement. He starves in the midst of abundance. Neglected among a people who would take more pity on an ill-used horse or a dying dog, he is a castaway upon the land. Of the throngs that pass heedlessly by him to homes of comfort, intent on business or on pleasure, there is no one cares for him. Poor wretch! O if he knew a Bible which none has taught him, how might he plant himself before us, and bar our way to church or prayer-meeting, saying, as he fixed on us an imploring eye, "Pure religion and undefiled before God" is to feed me—is to clothe these naked limbs—is to fill up these hollow cheeks—is to pour the light of knowledge into this darkened soul—is to save me—is not to go to house of God or place of prayer, but first coming with me to our miserable home, "to visit the widow and fatherless in their affliction, and keep thy garments unspotted from the world."

You can test the truth of these statements. You have only to walk along the street to verify them. Yet, bad as it looks, and bad as it is, the street reveals not half the evil. I know that some look with suspicion upon our statements. They doubt whether matters below are so bad as we report. They insinuate that surely we are exaggerating existing evils. Well, there is nothing more easy, although there might be many things more noble, than to lie beneath bright skies, and amid gay company, and on a flowery sward, and dismiss with an incredulous smile the claims of suffering humanity. It were more like a man and a Christian to throw yourself into the bucket, seize the chain, go down into the pit, and put the matter to the proof. We invite you to do that which will rudely dissipate every doubt, and bring you up, a better and wiser man, to say, with Sheba's queen, "The half was not told me." Meanwhile, come along with me, while I again travel over some bygone scenes.

Look there! In that corpse you see the cold, dead body of one of the best and godliest mothers it was ever our privilege to know. She had a son. He was the stay of her widowhood—so kind, so affectionate, so loving. Some are taken away from the "evil to come;" laid in the lap of mother earth, safe beneath the grave's green sod, they hear not and need not the storm that rages above. Such was not her happy fortune. She lived to see that son a disgrace, and all the promises of his youth blighted and gone. He was drawn into habits of intemperance. On her knees she pleaded with him. On her knees she prayed for him. How mysterious are the ways of Providence! She did not live to see him changed; and with such thorns in her pillow, such daggers, planted by such a hand, in her heart, she could not live. She sank under these griefs, and died of a broken heart. We told him so. With bitter, burning tears he owned it; charging himself with his mother's death—confessing himself a mother's murderer. Crushed with sorrow, and all alone, he went to see the body. Alone, beside that cold, dead, unreproaching mother, he knelt down and wept out his terrible remorse. After a while he rose. You have seen the iron approach the magnet. Call it spell, call it fascination, call it anything bad, demoniacal, but as the iron is drawn to the magnet, or as a fluttering bird, fascinated by the burning eye and glittering skin of the serpent, walks into its expanded, envenomed jaws, so was he drawn to the bottle. Unfortunately—how unfortunate that a spirit bottle should have been left there—his eye fell on the old tempter. Wondering at his delay, they entered the room; and now the bed holds two bodies—a dead mother, and her dead-drunk son. What a sight! what a humbling, horrible spectacle! And what a change from those happy times, when night drew her peaceful curtains around the same son and mother—he, a sweet babe, sleeping, angel-like, within her loving arms! "How is the gold become dim, the most fine gold changed!"

Or look there. The bed beside which you

have at other visits conversed and prayed with one who, in the very bloom and flower of youth, was withering away under a slow decline—is empty. The living need it; and so its long, and spent, and weary tenant lies now stretched out in death, on the top of two rude chests beside the window. And as you stand by the body—contemplating it—in that pallid face lighted up by a passing sun-gleam you see, along with lingering traces of no common beauty, the calmness and peace which were her latter end. But in this hot, sultry, summer weather, why lies she there uncoffined? Drink has left us to do that last office for the dead. Her father—how unworthy the name of father—when his daughter pled with him for his soul, pled with him for her mother, pled with him for her little sister, had stood by her dying pillow to damn her—fiercely damning her to her face. He has left his poor, dead child, to the care of others. With the wages he retains for drink, he refuses to buy that lifeless form a coffin and a grave!

Or look there. You have found a young man, the victim of an incurable malady, sinking into the tomb. Dying is hard enough work amid all the comforts which wealth, and kindness, and piety can command; but in that winter time, with the frosty wind blowing through the broken panes, he is shivering while he seeks in the Bible its precious comforts; and how much his body is emaciated is too plainly visible beneath that single threadbare coverlet. You could not have stood that; no more could we. And where, at our next visit, are the warm comforts charity had provided? They have gone for drink. Gone for drink! For such purpose, what incarnate demons have plucked the blankets from that wasted form—steeling their iron hearts against his cries, his struggles, his unavailing tears? Accursed vice! that can sink man beneath the brutes that perish. The barbarous deed was done by a father's hand! That father, instigated and aided by her who had suckled him on her breast, a breast twice withered—by worse than age, deformed and dried up!

Did I say sinks man beneath the brutes that perish? It is a libel on creation to speak of a drunkard as a brute. The bear, when she refuses to desert her cub, when she makes the most daring, desperate efforts to protect her offspring, when, rearing herself on her hind feet, she stands up growling to face the hunter, and offers her shaggy bosom to his spear, extorts our admiration; as does the little creature which, when the spear is buried in a mother's heart, leaps on her dead body, and, giving battle to the dogs, attempts bravely, though vainly, to defend it. Look at this case, and that. How beautiful is nature, how base is sin! Dr Kane tells a story, which excites our pity, of a savage man in those arctic regions, where God has poured such affection into the bosom of the fiercest animals. Noluk, when all other families in the time of famine had fled from their sick, remained faithful to his wife. She was dying. From waging fierce battle with the monsters of the deep, scaling the slippery iceberg, leaping the cracks of the ice-floe, homeward over the snowy wastes he drove his sledge each night, with food for her. The evening of his last visit arrives. He approaches the rude stone hut, looks in, and through a window sees his wife a corpse, and his infant son sucking at her frozen breast. Instinct moved him to enter, pluck away the child, and make a daring effort to save its life and his own. But the burden of a sucking babe, the pressing fears of famine, these mastered parental affection; and, claiming our pity for the grief that stood in his eye and wrung his heart, he turned the dogs southward, nor crossed the threshold.

But what emotions do the cases I have told you of awaken. To be matched by many and surpassed by some that I could tell—samples of the stock—what passion can they, what passion ought they to move, but the deepest indignation? Nor would I, however fiercely it may run, seek to stem the flood. The deeper it flows, the higher it rises, the stronger it swells and rolls, so much the better. I would not seek to stem, but to direct it—directing it not against the victims, but against the vice.

I pray you do not hate the drunkard; he hates himself. Do not despise him; he cannot sink so low in your opinion as he is sunk in his own. Your hatred and contempt may rivet, but will never rend his chains. Lend a kind hand to pluck him from the mire. With a strong hand shatter that bowl—remove the temptations which, while he hates, he cannot resist. Hate, abhor, tremble at his sin. And for pity's sake, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, for humanity's sake, rouse yourselves to the question, what can be done? Without heeding others—whether they follow or whether they stay—rushing down to the beach, throw yourself into the boat, push away, and bend on the oar, like a man, to the wreck. Say, I will not stand by and see my fellow-creatures perish. They are perishing. To save them I will do anything. What luxury will I not give up? What indulgence will I not abstain from? What customs, what shackles of old habits will I not break, that these hands may be freer to pluck the drowning from the deep? God my help, His Word my law, the love of His Son my ruling motive, I shall never balance a poor personal indulgence against the good of my country and the welfare of mankind. Brethren, such resolutions—such high, and holy, and sustained, and self-denying efforts—the height of this evil demands.

Before God and man, before the Church and the world, I impeach intemperance. I charge it with the murder of innumerable souls. In

this country, blessed with freedom and plenty, the Word of God and the liberties of true religion, I charge it as the cause—whatever be their source elsewhere—of almost all the poverty, and almost all the crime, and almost all the misery, and almost all the ignorance, and almost all the irreligion, that disgrace and afflict the land. "I am not mad, most noble Festus. I speak the words of truth and soberness." I do in my conscience believe that these intoxicating stimulants have sunk into perdition more men and women than found a grave in that deluge, which swept over the highest hill tops—engulphing a world, of which but eight were saved. As compared with other vices, it may be said of this, "Saul has slain his thousands, but David his tens of thousands."

III. Consider what cure we should apply to this evil.

The grand and only sovereign remedy for the evils of this world is the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. I believe that. There is no man more convinced of that than I am. But he rather hinders than helps the cause of religion who shuts his eyes to the fact, that, in curing souls, as in curing bodies, many things may be important as auxiliaries to the remedy, which cannot properly be considered as remedies. In the day of His resurrection Lazarus owed his life to Christ; but they that day did good service, who rolled away the stone. They were allies and auxiliaries. And to such, in the battle which the Gospel has to wage with this monster vice, allow me in closing this discourse to direct your attention. And I remark:

1. That the legislature may render essential service in this cause.

This is an alliance between Church and State which no man could quarrel with. Happy for our country, if by such help, the State would thus fulfil to the Church—the woman of prophecy—this apocalyptic vision: "And the serpent cast out of his mouth, water as a flood, after the woman, that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood. And the earth helped the woman. And the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed up the flood which the dragon cast out of his mouth."

Many people feel no sympathy with the sufferings of the lowest class. They are not hard-hearted; but engrossed with their own affairs, or, raised far above them in social position, they are ignorant of their temptations and trials. Therefore they talk ignorantly about them; and seldom more so than when they repudiate all attempts of the legislature by restrictive Acts of Parliament to abate, if not abolish, this evil. They have their remedies. Some plead for better lodgings and sanitary measures; which we also regard as highly valuable. Some put their faith in education—an agent, the importance of which, to the rising generation, it is impossible to overestimate. Some seem to have no confidence in anything but the preaching of the Gospel. To one or other of these, or the combined influence of them all, they trust for the cure of drunkenness—repudiating and deprecating all legislative interference. Now, I should like as much as they to see the very lowest of our people so elevated in their tastes, with minds so cultivated, and hearts so sanctified, that they could resist the temptations which on every hand beset them. But thousands, tens of thousands, are unable to do so. They must be helped with crutches till they have acquired the power to walk. They must be propped up and fenced round with every possible protection until they are "rooted and grounded in the love of God." In the country I have often seen a little child, with her sun-browned face, and long golden locks, sweet as any flower she pressed beneath her naked foot, merry as any bird that sung from bush or brake, driving the cattle home; and with fearless hand controlling the sulky leader of the herd, as with armed forehead and colossal strength he quailed before that slight image of God. Some days ago, I saw a different sight—such a child, with hanging head, no music in his voice, nor blush but that of shame upon his cheek, leading home a drunken father along the public street. That man required to be led, guided, guarded. And into a condition hardly less helpless large masses of our people have sunk. I don't wonder that they drink.

Look at their unhappy and most trying circumstances. Many of them are born with a propensity to this vice. They suck it in with a mother's milk: for it is a well ascertained fact that other things are hereditary besides cancer, and consumption, and insanity. This vice presents some of the characters of a physical disease, and the drunken parent transmits to his children a proneness to his fatal indulgence. Besides, the foul atmosphere which many of them breathe, the hard labour by which many of them earn their bread, produce a prostration which seeks in stimulants something to rally the system, nor will be debarred from their use by any prospect of danger, or experience of a corresponding reaction. With our cultivated minds, our improved tastes, our books, our recreations, our domestic comforts, we have no adequate idea of the temptations to which the poor are exposed, and from which it is the truest kindness to protect them. They are cold, and the glass is warmth. They are hungry, and drink is food. They are miserable, and there is laughter in the flowing cup. They are sunk in their own esteem, and the bowl or bottle surrounds the drunkard with a bright-coloured halo of self-respect—so long as the fumes are in his brain, he feels himself a man. "They drink to forget their poverty, and remember their misery no more."

Such indeed has been the only training, such

are the physical, economical, moral, and religious conditions of large masses of the people, that their safety lies, not in resisting temptation, but escaping it. None know that better than themselves. How would thousands hail and bless the day which, shutting up the drinking shops, would preserve them from the temptations which are their ruin, and to which they at length passively yield themselves; although, as one said, they know their doors to be the way to hell. Yet not passively, until this fatal pleasure has paralysed the mind more even than the body. Many struggle hard to overcome this passion. Ah, there is often a long and terrible fight between the man and the serpent that has him fast in his coils; between the love of wife and children and the love of drink. Never more manfully than some of them, did swimmer struggle in his hour of agony—breasting the waves and straining every nerve to reach the distant shore. Would Parliament but leave this matter to these people themselves—would they for once delegate their powers of legislation to the inhabitants of our lowest districts—we are confident that, by their all but unanimous vote, every drinking shop in their neighbourhoods would be shut up. The birds, which are now drawn into the mouth of the serpent, would soar aloft on free and joyous wing to sing the praises of the hand that closed its jaws, and the heel that crushed its head. And so long as religion stands by—silent and unprotesting against the temptations with which men, greedy of gain, and governments, greedy of revenue, surround the wretched victims of this basest vice—it appears to me an utter mockery for her to go with the Word of God in her hand, teaching them to say, "Lead us not into temptation."

As a man, as well as a minister of that blessed Gospel, which recognises no distinction between rich and poor, I protest against the wrongs of a class that are to the full as unfortunate as they are guilty. They deserve succour rather than censure. They are more to be pitied than punished. And, assuming the office of their advocate, I wish to know why the upper classes of society should enjoy a protection which is denied to those who stand more in need of it? Gambling houses were proved before Parliament to be ruining the youth of the aristocracy. Nobility complained. Coronets and broad acres were in danger. Parliament rose to the rescue. She put forth her strong hand, and by a sweeping, summary, most righteous measure, put the evil down. It was also proved in Parliament, that betting houses were corrupting the morals of our merchants' clerks, our shopmen, our tradesmen, and others of the middle classes of society. Once more Parliament rose up in its might, threw its broad shield over wealth and commerce, and closed every betting house in the metropolis. Who talked then about the freedom of trade? When the honour of noble families, or the wealth of our merchants, and the honesty of their servants demanded protection, who talked about the freedom of trade? When the honour of noble families, or the wealth of our merchants, and the honesty of their servants demanded protection, who talked about the liberty of the subject? Who proposed to leave these evils to be met by education and such means as education? I don't complain of, but commend the measures which Parliament adopted. Only, I want to know, if the virtues of humble families and the happiness of the poor are less worthy of protection than the wealth of bankers, and the honours of an ancient nobility? I want to know if the bodies of the higher and wealthier classes are of better clay, or their souls of finer elements, than those of the very lowest of the people? Yet I would undertake to prove that, year by year, thousands and tens of thousands of our poor suffer the loss of fortune, virtue, character, body and soul, in those drinking shops that glare upon the public eye—which the law does not forbid but license. For every one the gambling or betting house ruined, they are ruining hundreds. I wish that those who govern this noble country should be able to say with Him who governs the universe, "Are not my ways equal?" Nor let our legislators be scared from their duty in this case, any more than they were in the other, by the allegation that to shut up the drinking shop will not cure but rather aggravate the evil, by leading to illicit traffic and secret drinking. The removal of the temptation may not always cure the drunkard: I don't say it will. But it will check the growth of his class, and prevent many others from learning his habits—until sanguine men might entertain the blessed hope that, like the monsters of a former epoch, which now lie entombed in the rocks, drunkards may be numbered among the extinct races, classified with the winged serpents and gigantic sloths that were once inhabitants of our globe.

The subject before us is eminently calculated to illustrate the profound remark of one, who was well acquainted with the temptations and circumstances of the poor. He said: "It is justice, not charity, that the poor most need." And all we ask is, that you be as kind to them as to the rich. All we ask is, that you guard the one class as carefully as you guard the other from the temptations peculiar to their lot. I am sorry to say—but truth and the interests of those who, however sunk and degraded, are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, require that I should say—that this is not done. The "poor," says Amos, "are sold for a pair of shoes," and with us they are sold to save the wealth of the rich. In this I make no charge which I am not prepared to prove. For example: Certain measures were proposed in Parliament with the view of promoting the comforts and improving the moral habits of the

common people. It was admitted that these, by introducing weak French and Rhenish wines in room of ardent spirits and strongly intoxicating liquors, would be attended with that most happy and desirable result. Yet they were rejected. And rejected because their adoption, although it saved the people, would damage the revenue. As if there was not money enough in the pockets of the wealthy, through means of other taxes, to meet the debts of the nation and sustain the honour of the Crown! How different the tone of morals even in China! The ministers of that country proved to their sovereign that he would avert all danger of war with Britain, and also add immensely to his revenue, if he would consent to legalise the trade in opium. He refused, firmly refused, nobly refused. And it were a glorious day for Britain, a happy day for ten thousand miserable homes—a day for bonfires, and jubilant cannon, and merry bells, and bannered processions, and holy thanksgivings, which saw our beloved Queen rise from her throne, and in the name of this great nation address to her Lords and Commons the memorable speech of that pagan monarch: "I will never consent to raise my revenue out of the ruin and vices of my people." With such a spirit may God imbue our land! "Even so come, Lord Jesus, come quickly."

2. That the example of abstaining from all intoxicating liquors would greatly aid in the cure of this evil.

No principle is more clearly inculcated in the Word of God, and none, carried out into action, makes a man more Christ-like than self-denial. "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." That is the principle of temperance, as I hold it. I cannot agree with those who, in their anxiety for good, attempt to prove too much, and condemn as positively sinful the moderate use of stimulants. But still less sympathy have I with those who dare to call in Jesus Christ to lend His holy countenance to their luxurious boards. It is shocking to hear men attempt to prove, by the Word of God, that it is a duty to drink—to fill the wine-cup and drain off the glass.

I was able to use without abusing. But seeing to what monstrous abuse the thing had grown, seeing in what a multitude of cases the use was followed by the abuse, and seeing how the example of the upper classes, the practices of ministers, and the habits of church members were used to shield and sanction indulgences so often carried to excess, I saw the case to be one for the apostle's warning: "Take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to them that are weak." Paul says of meat offered unto an idol: "Meat commendeth us not to God; for neither if we eat are we the better, neither if we eat not are we the worse." And will any man deny, that, save in medical cases, I can with the most perfect truth adopt the words of inspiration, and say of these stimulants what Paul says of meat: "Drink commendeth us not to God; for neither if we drink are we the better, and neither if we drink not are we the worse." On the contrary, the testimony of physicians, the experience of those who, in Arctic cold or Indian heat, have been exposed to influences the most trying to the constitution, the experience also of every one who has exchanged temperate indulgence for rigid abstinence, have demonstrated that, if we drink not, we are the better. There is no greater delusion in this world than that health, or strength, or joyousness is dependent on the use of such stimulants. So far as happiness is concerned, we can afford to leave such means to those who inhabit the doleful dens of sin. They cannot want them. They have to relieve the darkness with lurid gleams. They have to drown remorse in the bowl's oblivion. They have to bury the recollection of what they were, and the sense of what they are, and the foreboding of what they shall be—as one of them said, "We poor girls could not lead the life we do without the drink."

Grant that there were a sacrifice in abstaining, what Christian man would hesitate to make it, if by doing so he can honour God and bless mankind? If by a life-long abstinence from all those pleasures which the wine-cup yields I can save one child from a life of misery—I can save one mother from premature grey hairs, and griefs that bring her to the grave—I can save one woman from ruin—bringing him to Jesus, I can save one man from perdition—I should hold myself well repaid. Living thus, living not for myself, when death summons me to my account, and the Judge says, Man, where is thy brother? I shall be found walking, although at a humble distance, in the footprints of Him who took His way to Calvary. He said, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me." This cross, which has been borne by missionaries to pagan lands, which has been held high in the battle-field by men nobly fighting for their faith, which rose above the red scaffold flowing with martyr's blood, may be carried into our scenes of social enjoyment, and, a brighter ornament than any jewels flashing on beauty's breast, may adorn the festive table. If this abstinence is a cross, all the more honour to the men who carry it. It is a right noble thing to live for God and the good of man.

I attempt to dictate on this subject to no man. Believing it to be one specially open to the apostolic rule, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," I would yet venture to appeal to my brethren in the ministry, and to the members of every Christian church. There cannot be a doubt—not the shadow of a doubt—that if, devoting yourselves Christ-like

to the glory of God and the good of men, you saw it to be your duty to embrace the principle of abstinence, the result would be remarkable. Such would be the influence of your example within your own households, and outside in your different neighbourhoods, and such also the power which you could exercise in the Parliament of our country, that intemperance, with all its direful damning consequences, would be, to a great extent and in time, banished from the land. What a land ours then would be! Relieved from this mill-stone which hangs about her neck, and weighs her down and bends her giant power to the earth, into what an attitude and height of power would she rise? Who then would dare to insult her flag? Who then would dare to cross her path, when she went forth in her might and virtue to assert the liberties of the world—to break the fetters of the slave or fight the battle of the oppressed? She would hear no more taunts from the slave-holders of the West or the despots of the South. Her piety, and sobriety, and virtues, preserving salt, elements of national immortality, she might hope to be exempted from the fate of all preceding empires, that, one after another, in unfailing succession, have gone down into the tomb.

This moral revolution in our national habits, this greatest of all reforms, every one can engage in. Women and children as well as men, can help it onwards to the goal. It is attainable, if we would only attempt it. It is hopeful, if we would but give the subject a fair consideration. Why should not the power of Christianity, by its mighty arguments of love and self-denial, lead to the disuse of intoxicating stimulants, and so achieve that which Mahommedanism and Hindooism have done? Must the cross pale before the crescent? Must the divine religion of Jesus, with that God-man upon the tree for its invincible ensign, blush before such rivals, and own itself unable to accomplish what false faiths have done? Tell us not that it cannot be done. It can be done. It has been done—done by the enemies of the cross of Christ—done by the followers of an impostor—done by worshippers of stocks and stones. "And their rock is not like our Rock." If that is true—and it cannot be gainsaid—I may surely claim from every man who has faith in God, and loves Jesus, and is willing to live for the benefit of mankind, a candid, a full, and a prayerful consideration of this subject. But, whatever be the means, whatever the weapons you will judge it best to employ, when trumpets are blowing in Zion, and the alarm is sounding and echoing in God's holy mountain, come—come to the help of the Lord against the mighty, crowd to the standard, press to the front, throw yourself into the thick of battle, and die in harness fighting for the cause of Jesus. So "to live is Christ, and so to die is gain."

RICHARD COBDEN.

1804-1865.

FREE TRADE.

[FROM a speech in the House of Commons during the debate on the Corn Laws, 27th February 1846.]

But the truth is, that you all know—that the country knows—that there never was a more monstrous delusion than to suppose that that which goes to increase the trade of the country, and to extend its manufactures and commerce—that which adds to our numbers, increases our population, enlarges the number of your customers, and diminishes your burdens by multiplying the shoulders that are to bear them, and giving them increased strength to bear them—can possibly tend to diminish the value of land. You may affect the value of silks; you may affect the value of cottons or woollens; transitory changes of fashion may do that—changes of taste; but there is a taste for land inherent in human kind, and especially is it the desire of Englishmen to possess land; and therefore, whilst you have a monopoly of that article which our very instincts lead us to desire to possess, if you see any process going on by which our commerce and our numbers are increased, it is impossible to suppose that it can have the effect of diminishing the value of the article that is in your hands.

What, then, is the good of this "protection?" What is this boasted "protection?" Why, the country has come to regard it, as they do witchcraft, as a mere sound and a delusion. They no more regard your precautions against free trade, than they regard the horse-shoes that are nailed over the stables to keep the witches away from the horses. They do not believe in protection; they have no fear of free trade; and they are laughing to scorn all the arguments by which you are trying to frighten them.

How can protection, think you, add to the wealth of a country? Can you by legislation add one farthing to the wealth of the country?

You may, by legislation, in one evening destroy the accumulations of a century of labour, but I defy you to show me how, by the legislation of this House, you can add one farthing to the wealth of the country. That springs from the industry and intelligence of the people of this country. You cannot guide that intelligence; you cannot do better than leave it to its own instincts. If you attempt by legislation to give any direction to trade or industry, it is a thousand to one that you are doing wrong; and if you happen to be right, it is a work of supererogation, for the parties for whom you legislate would go right without you, and better than with you.

Then, if this is true, why should there be any difference of opinion between us? Honourable gentlemen may think that I have spoken hardly to them on this occasion, but I want to see them come to a better conclusion on this question. I believe if they will look the thing in the face, and divest themselves of that crust of prejudice that oppresses them, we shall all be better friends about it. There are but two things that can prevent it; one is their believing that they have a sinister interest in this question, and, therefore, not looking into it; and the other is an incapacity for understanding political economy. I know there are many heads who cannot comprehend and master a proposition in political economy; I believe that study is the highest exercise of the human mind, and that the exact sciences require by no means so hard an effort. But, barring these two accidents—want of capacity and having a sinister interest—I defy any man to look into this question honestly, and come to any other than one conclusion. Then why should we not agree? I want no triumph in this matter for the Anti-Corn-Law League. I want you to put an end from conviction to an evil system. Come down to us, and let us hold a free trade meeting in our hall at Manchester. Come to us now, protectionists, and let us see whether we cannot do something better for our common country than carrying on this strife of parties. Let us, once for all, recognise this principle, that we must not tax one another for the benefit of one another.

Now, I am going to read to you an authority that will astonish you. I am going to read you an extract from a speech of the Duke of Wellington, in the House of Lords, on the 17th of April 1832; it is his opinion on taxation:

"He thought taxes were imposed only for the service of the State. If they were necessary for the service of the State, in God's name let them be paid; but if they were not necessary they ought not to be paid, and legislature ought not to impose them."

Now, there that noble duke, without having had time to study Adam Smith, or Ricardo, by that native sagacity which is characteristic of his mind, came at once to the marrow of the matter. We must not tax one another for the benefit of one another. Oh, then, divest the future Prime Minister of this country of that odious task of having to reconcile rival interests; divest the office, if ever you would have a sagacious man in power as prime minister, divest it of the responsibility of having to find food for the people! May you never find a Prime Minister again to undertake that awful responsibility! That responsibility belongs to the laws of nature; as Burke said, it belongs to God alone to regulate the supply of the food of nations. When you shall have seen in three years that the abolition of these laws is inevitable, as inevitable it is, you will come forward and join with the free-traders; for if you do not, you will have the farmers coming forward and agitating in conjunction with the league. You are in a position to gain honour in future; you are in a position, especially the young members among you, who have the capacity to learn the truth of this question, they are in a position to gain honour in this struggle; but, as you are going on at present, your position is a false one; you are in the wrong groove, and are every day more and more diverging from the right point. It may be material for you to get right notions of political economy; questions of that kind will form a great part of the world's legislation for a long time to come.

We are on the eve of great changes. Put yourselves in a position to be able to help in the work, and so gather honour and fame where they are to be gained. You belong to the aristocracy of the human kind—not the privileged aristocracy—I don't mean that, but the aristocracy of improvement and civilisation. We have set an example to the world in all ages; we have given them the representative system. The very rules and regulations of this House have been taken as the model for every representative assembly throughout the whole civilised world; and having besides given them the example of a free press and religious freedom, and every institution that belongs to freedom and civilisation, we are now about giving a still greater example; we are going to set the example of making industry free—to set the example of giving the whole world every advantage of clime and latitude and situation, relying ourselves on the freedom of our industry. Yes, we are going to teach the world that other lesson. Don't think there is anything selfish in this, or anything discordant with Christian principles. I can prove that we advocate nothing but what is agreeable to the highest behests of Christianity. To buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest. What is the meaning of the maxim? It means that you take the article which you have in the greatest abundance, and with it obtain from others that of which they have the most to spare; so giving to mankind the means of enjoying the fullest abundance of earth's goods,

and, in doing so, carrying out to the fullest extent the Christian doctrine of "Doing to all men as ye would they should do unto you."

THE WAR WITH RUSSIA.

[From a speech in the House of Commons, December 22, 1854. The then War Secretary, the Duke of Newcastle, had introduced a bill to raise a force of 15,000 foreigners, who were to be drilled in this country. Though opposed by the Conservative party, the bill was carried on December 22d].

To set myself right with those hon. gentlemen who profess to have great regard for liberty everywhere, I beg to state that I yield to no one in sympathy for those who are struggling for freedom in any part of the world; but I will never sanction an interference which shall go to establish this or that nationality by force of arms, because that invades a principle which I wish to carry out in the other direction—the prevention of all foreign interference with nationalities for the sake of putting them down. Therefore, while I respect the motives of those gentlemen, I cannot act with them. This admission, however, I freely make, that, were it likely to advance the cause of liberty, of constitutional freedom, and national independence, it would be a great inducement to me to acquiesce in the war, or, at all events, I should see in it something like a compensation for the multiplied evils which attend a state of war.

And now we come to what is called the statesman's ground for this war: which is, that it is undertaken to defend the Turkish empire against the encroachments of Russia—as a part of the scheme, in fact, for keeping the several states of Europe within those limits in which they are at present circumscribed. This has been stated as a ground for carrying on the present war with Russia; but, I must say, this view of the case has been very much mixed up with magniloquent phraseology, which has tended greatly to embarrass the question. The noble lord, the member for the city of London, was the first, I think, to commence these magniloquent phrases, in a speech at Greenock about last August twelvemonths, in which he spoke of our duties to mankind, and to the whole world; and he has often talked since of this war as one intended to protect the liberties of all Europe and of the civilised world. I remember, too, the phrases which the noble lord made use of at a city meeting, where he spoke of our being "engaged in a just and necessary war, for no immediate advantage, but for the defence of our ancient ally, and for the maintenance of the independence of Europe." Well, I have a word to say to the noble lord on that subject. Now, we are placed to the extreme west of a continent, numbering some 200,000,000 inhabitants; and the theory is, that there is great danger from a growing Eastern power, which threatens to overrun the Continent, to inflict upon it another deluge like that of the Goths and Vandals, and to eclipse the light of civilisation in the darkness of barbarism. But, if that theory be correct, does it not behove the people of the Continent to take some part in pushing back that deluge of barbarism? I presume it is not intended that England should be the Anacharsis Clootz of Europe; but that, at all events, if we are to fight for everybody, those, at least, who are in the greatest danger, will join with us in resisting the common enemy. I am convinced, however, that all this declamation about the independence of Europe and the defence of civilisation will by-and-by disappear. I take it for granted, then, that the statesman's object in this war is to defend Turkey against the encroachments of Russia, and so to set a barrier against the aggressive ambition of that great empire. That is the language of the Queen's speech. But have we not accomplished that object? I would ask, have we not arrived at that point? Have we not effected all that was proposed in the Queen's speech? Russia is now no longer within the Turkish territory; she has renounced all idea of invading Turkey; and now, as we are told by the noble lord, there have been put forward certain proposals from Russia, which are to serve as the basis of peace.

What are those proposals? In the first place, there is to be a joint protectorate over the Christians by the five great powers; there is to be a joint guarantee for the rights and privileges of the principalities; there is to be a revision of the rule laid down in 1841 with regard to the entrance of ships of war into the Bosphorus, and the Danube is to be free to all nations. These are the propositions that are made for peace, as we are told by the noble lord; and it is competent for us, I think, as a House of Commons, to offer an opinion as to the desirability of a treaty on those terms.

My first reason for urging that we should entertain those proposals is, that we are told that Austria and Prussia have agreed to them. Those two powers are more interested in this quarrel than England and France can be. Upon that subject I will quote the words of the noble lord the member for Tiverton, uttered in February last. The noble lord said:

"We know that Austria and Prussia had an interest in the matter more direct and greater than had either France or England. To Austria and Prussia it is a vital matter—a matter of existence—because, if Russia were either to appropriate any large portion of the Turkish territory, or even to reduce Turkey to the condition of a mere dependent state, it must be manifest to any man who casts a glance over the map of Europe, and who looks at the geographical position of these two powers with

regard to Russia and Turkey, that any considerable accession of power on the part of Russia in that quarter must be fatal to the independence of action of both Austria and Prussia."

I entirely concur with the noble lord in his view of the interest which Austria and Prussia have in this quarrel, and what I want to ask is this, Why should we seek greater guarantees and stricter engagements from Russia than those with which Austria and Prussia are content? They lie on the frontier of this great empire, and they have more to fear from its power than we can have; no Russian invasion can touch us until it has passed over them; and is it likely, if we fear, as we say we do, that Western Europe will be overrun by Russian barbarism—is it likely, I say, that since Austria and Prussia will be the first to suffer, they will not be as sensible to that danger as we can be? Ought we not rather to take it as a proof that we have somewhat exaggerated the danger which threatens Western Europe, when we find that Austria and Prussia are not so alarmed at it as we are? They are not greatly concerned about the danger, I think, or else they would join with England and France in a great battle to push it back. If, then, Austria and Prussia are ready to accept these proposals, why should not we be? Do you suppose that, if Russia really meditated an attack upon Germany—that if she had an idea of annexing the smallest portion of German territory, with only 100,000 inhabitants of Teutonic blood, all Germany would not be united as one man to resist her? Is there not a strong national feeling in that Germanic race?—are they not nearly 40,000,000 in number?—are they not the most intelligent, the most instructed, and have they not proved themselves the most patriotic people in Europe? And if they are not dissatisfied, why should we stand out for better conditions, and why should we make greater efforts and greater sacrifices to obtain peace than they? I may be told, that the people and the government of Germany are not quite in harmony on these points. (Cheers.) Hon. gentlemen who cheer ought to be cautious, I think, how they assume that governments do not represent their people. How would you like the United States to accept that doctrine with regard to this country? But I venture to question the grounds upon which that opinion is formed. I have taken some little pains to ascertain the feeling of the people in Germany on this war, and I believe that if you were to poll the population of Prussia—which is the brain of Germany—whilst nineteen-twentieths would say that in this quarrel England is right and Russia wrong; nay, whilst they would say they wished success to England as against Russia—yet, on the contrary, if you were to poll the same population as to whether they would join England with an army to fight against Russia, I believe, from all I have heard, that nineteen-twentieths would support their king in his present pacific policy.

But I want to know which is the advantage of having the vote of a people like that in your favour, if they are not inclined to join you in action? There is, indeed, a wide distinction between the existence of a certain opinion in the minds of a people and a determination to go to war in support of that opinion. I think we were rather too precipitate in transferring our opinion into acts; that we rushed to arms with too much rapidity; and that if we had abstained from war, continuing to occupy the same ground as Austria and Prussia, the result would have been that Russia would have left the principalities, and have crossed the Pruth; and that, without a single shot being fired, you would have accomplished the object for which you have gone to war. But what are the grounds on which we are to continue this war, when the Germans have acquiesced in the proposals of peace which have been made? Is it that war is a luxury? Is it that we are fighting—to use a cant phrase of Mr Pitt's time—to secure indemnity for the past and security for the future? Are we to be the Don Quixotes of Europe, to go about fighting for every cause where we find that some one has been wronged? In most quarrels there is generally a little wrong on both sides; and, if we make up our minds always to interfere when any one is being wronged, I do not see always how we are to choose between the two sides. It will not do always to assume that the weaker party is in the right, for little states, like little individuals, are often very quarrelsome, presuming on their weakness, and not unfrequently abusing the forbearance which their weakness procures them. But the question is, on what ground of honour or interest are we to continue to carry on this war, when we may have peace upon conditions which are satisfactory to the great countries of Europe who are near neighbours of this formidable power? There is neither honour nor interest forfeited, I think, in accepting these terms, because we have already accomplished the object for which it was said this war was begun.

The questions which have since arisen, with regard to Sebastopol, for instance, are mere points of detail, not to be bound up with the original quarrel. I hear many people say, "We will take Sebastopol, and then we will treat for peace." I am not going to say that you cannot take Sebastopol—I am not going to argue against the power of England and France. I might admit, for the sake of argument, that you can take Sebastopol. You may occupy ten miles of territory in the Crimea for any time; you may build there a town; you may carry provisions and reinforcements there, for you have the command of the sea; but while you do all this, you

will have no peace with Russia. Nobody who knows the history of Russia can think for a moment that you are going permanently to occupy any portion of her territory, and, at the same time, to be at peace with that empire. But admitting your power to do all this, is the object which you seek to accomplish worth the sacrifice which it will cost you? Can anybody doubt that the capture of Sebastopol will cost you a prodigious sacrifice of valuable lives; and, I ask you, is the object to be gained worth that sacrifice? The loss of treasure I will leave out of the question, for that may be replaced, but we can never restore to this country those valuable men who may be sacrificed in fighting the battles of their country—perhaps the most energetic, the bravest, the most devoted body of men that ever left these islands. You may sacrifice them, if you like, but you are bound to consider whether the object will compensate you for that sacrifice.

I will assume that you take Sebastopol; but for what purpose is it that you will take it, for you cannot permanently occupy the Crimea without being in a perpetual state of war with Russia? It is, then, I presume, as a point of honour, that you insist upon taking it, because you have once commenced the siege. The noble lord, speaking of this fortress, said: "If Sebastopol, that great stronghold of Russian power, were destroyed, its fall would go far to give that security to Turkey which was the object of the war." But I utterly deny that Sebastopol is the stronghold of Russian power. It is simply an outward and visible sign of the power of Russia; but, by destroying Sebastopol, you do not, by any means destroy that power. You do not destroy or touch Russian power, unless you can permanently occupy some portion of its territory, disorder its industry, or disturb its government. If you can strike at its capital, if you can deprive it of some of its immense fertile plains, or take possession of those vast rivers which empty themselves into the Black Sea, then, indeed, you strike at Russian power; but, suppose you take Sebastopol, and make peace to-morrow; in ten years, I tell you, the Russian Government will come to London for a loan to build it up again stronger than before. And as for destroying those old, green fir-ships, you only do the emperor a service by giving him an opportunity for building fresh ones.

Is not the celebrated case of Dunkirk exactly in point? In 1713, at the treaty of Utrecht, the French king, under sore necessity, consented to destroy Dunkirk. It had been built under the direction of Vauban, who had exhausted his genius and the coffers of the state in making it as strong as science and money could make it. The French king bound himself to demolish it, and the English sent over two commissioners to see the fortress thrown to the ground, the jetties demolished and cast into the harbour, and a mole or bank built across the channel leading into the port; and you would have thought Dunkirk was destroyed once and for ever. There was a treaty binding the king not to rebuild it, and which on two successive occasions was renewed. Some years afterwards a storm came and swept away the mole or bank which blocked up the channel, by which accident ingress and egress were restored; and shortly afterwards, a war breaking out between England and Spain, the French Government took advantage of our being engaged elsewhere, and rebuilt the fortifications on the sea side, as the historian tells us, much stronger than before. The fact is recorded, that in the Seven Years' War, about forty years afterwards, Dunkirk, for all purposes of aggression by sea, was more formidable than ever. We had in that case a much stronger motive for destroying Dunkirk than we can ever have in the case of Sebastopol; for in the war which ended in the peace of Utrecht, there were 1600 English merchant vessels, valued at £1,250,000, taken by privateers which came out of Dunkirk.

Then again in the middle of the last century, we destroyed Cherbourg, and during the last war we held possession of Toulon; but did we thereby destroy the power of France? If we could have got hold of some of her fertile provinces—if we could have taken possession of her capital, or struck at her vitals, we might have permanently impoverished and diminished her power and resources; but we could not do it by the simple demolition of this or that fortress. So it would be in this case—we might take Sebastopol, and then make peace; but there would be the rankling wound—there would be a venom in the treaty which would determine Russia to take the first opportunity of reconstructing this fortress. There would be storms, too, there, which would destroy whatever mole we might build across the harbour of Sebastopol, for storms in the Black Sea are more frequent, as we know, than in the Channel; but even if Sebastopol were utterly destroyed, there are many places on the coast of the Crimea which might be occupied for a similar purpose.

But then comes the question, Will the destruction of Sebastopol give security to the Turks? The Turkish empire will only be safe when its internal condition is secure, and you are not securing the internal condition of Turkey while you are at war; on the contrary, I believe you are now doing more to demoralise the Turks and destroy their government than you could possibly have done in time of peace. If you wish to secure Turkey, you must reform its government, purify its administration, unite its people, and draw out its resources; and then it will not present the spectacle of misery and poverty that it does now. Why, you yourselves have recognised the existing state of Turkey to be so bad that you intend to make a treaty

which shall bind the five powers to a guarantee for the better treatment of the Christians. But have you considered well the extent of the principle in which you are embarking? You contemplate making a treaty, by which the five powers are to do that together which Russia has hitherto claimed to do herself. What sort of conclusion do you think disinterested and impartial critics—people in the United States, for instance—will draw from such a policy? They must come to the conclusion that we have been rather wrong in our dealings with Russia, if we have gone to war with her to prevent her doing that very thing which we ourselves propose to do, in conjunction with the other powers. If so much mischief has sprung from the protectorate of one power, Heaven help the Turks when the protectorate of the five powers is inaugurated! But, at this very moment, I understand that a mixed commission is sitting at Vienna, to serve as a court of appeal for the Danubian principalities; in fact, that Moldavia and Wallachia are virtually governed by a commission representing Austria, England, France, and Turkey.

Now, this is the very principle of interference against which I wish to protest. From this I derive a recognition of the exceptional internal condition of Turkey, which, I say, will be your great difficulty upon the restoration of peace. Well, then, would it not be more statesman-like in the Government, instead of appealing, with clap-trap arguments, to heedless passions out of doors, and telling the people that Turkey has made more progress in the career of regeneration during the last twenty years than any other country under the sun, at once to address themselves to the task before them—the reconstruction of the internal system of that empire? Be sure this is what you will have to do, make peace when you may; for everybody knows that, once you withdraw your support and your agency from her, Turkey must immediately collapse, and sink into a state of anarchy. The fall of Sebastopol would only make the condition of Turkey the worse; and, I repeat, that your real and most serious difficulty will begin when you have to undertake the management of that country's affairs, after you withdraw from it, and when you will have to re-establish her as an independent state. I would not have said a word about the condition of Turkey, but for the statement twice so jauntily made about her social progress by the noble lord the member for Tiverton. Why, what says the latest traveller in that country on this head? Lord Carlisle, in his recent work, makes the following remarks on the state of the Mahometan population, after describing the improving condition of the Porte's Christian subjects:

"But when you leave the partial splendours of the capital and the great state establishments, what is it you find over the broad surface of a land which nature and climate have favoured beyond all others, once the home of all art and all civilisation? Look yourself—ask those who live there—deserted villages, uncultivated plains, banditti-haunted mountains, torpid laws, a corrupt administration, a disappearing people."

Why, the testimony borne by every traveller, from Lamartine downwards, is, that the Mahometan population is perishing—is dying out from its vices, and those vices of a nameless character. In fact, we do not know the true social state of Turkey, because it is indescribable; and Lord Carlisle, in his work, says that he is constrained to avoid referring to it. The other day, Dr Hadly, who had lately returned from Turkey, where he had a near relation who had been physician to the embassy for about thirty-five years, stated in Manchester that his relative told him that the population of Constantinople, into which there is a large influx from the provinces, has considerably diminished during the last twenty years, a circumstance which he attributes to the indescribable social vices of the Turks. Now, I ask, are you doing anything to promote habits of self-reliance or self-respect among this people by going to war in their behalf? On the contrary, the moment your troops landed at Gallipoli, the activity and energy of the French killed a poor pacha there, who took to his bed, and died from pure distraction of mind; and from that time to this you have done nothing but humiliate and demoralise the Turkish character more than ever. I have here a letter from a friend, describing the conflagration which took place at Varna, in which he says, it was curious to see how our sailors, when they landed to extinguish the fire in the Turkish houses, thrust the poor Turks aside, exactly as if they had been so many infant-school children in England. Another private letter, which I recently received from an officer of high rank in the Crimea, states:

"We are degrading the Turk as fast as we can; he is now the scavenger of the two armies as far as he can be made so. He won't fight, and his will to work is little better; he won't be trusted again to try the former, and now the latter is all he is allowed to do. When there are entrenchments to be made, or dead to be buried, the Turks do it. They do it as slowly and lazily as they can, but do it they must. This is one way of raising the Turk; it is propping him up on one side, to send him headlong down a deeper precipice on the other."

That is what you are doing by the process that is now going on in Turkey. I dare say you are obliged to take the whole command into your own hands, because you find no native power—no administrative authority in that country; and you cannot rely on the Turks for anything. If they send an army to the Crimea, the sick are abandoned to the plague or the cholera,

and having no commissariat, their soldiers are obliged to beg a crust at the tents of our men. Why, sir, what an illustration you have in the facts relating to our sick and wounded at Constantinople of the helpless supineness of the Turks! I mention these things, as the whole gist of the Eastern question lies in the difficulty arising from the prostrate condition of this race. Your troops would not be in this quarter at all, but for the anarchy and barbarism that reign in Turkey.

Well, you have an hospital at Scutari, where there are some thousands of your wounded. They are wounded Englishmen, brought there from the Crimea, where they have gone, 3000 miles from their own home, to fight the battles of the Turks. Would you not naturally expect that when these miserable and helpless sufferers were brought to the Turkish capital, containing 700,000 souls, those in whose cause they have shed their blood would at once have a friendly and generous care taken of them? Supposing the case had been that these wounded men had been fighting for the cause of Prussia, and that they had been sent from the frontiers of that country to Berlin, which has only half the population of Constantinople, would the ladies of the former capital, do you think, have allowed these poor creatures to have suffered from the want of lint or of nurses? Does not the very fact that you have to send out everything for your wounded prove either that the Turks despise and detest, and would spit upon you, or that they are so feeble and incompetent as not to have the power of helping you in the hour of your greatest necessity? The people of England have been grossly misled regarding the state of Turkey. I am bound to consider that the noble lord the member for Tiverton expressed his honest convictions on this point; but certainly the unfortunate ignorance of one in his high position has had a most mischievous effect on the public opinion of this country, for it undoubtedly has been the prevalent impression out of doors that the Turks are thoroughly capable of regeneration and self-government—that the Mahometan population are fit to be restored to independence, and that we have only to fight their battle against their external enemies, in order to enable them to exercise the functions of a great power. A greater delusion than this, however, I believe, never existed in any civilised state.

Well, if, as I say is the case, the unanimous testimony of every traveller—German, French, English, and American—for the last twenty years, attests the decay and helplessness of the Turks, are you not wasting your treasure and your men's precious lives before Sebastopol in an enterprise that cannot in the least aid the solution of your real difficulty? If you mean to take the Emperor of Russia eventually into your counsels—for this is the drift of my argument—if you contemplate entering into a quintuple alliance, to which he will be one of the parties, in order to manipulate the shattered remains of Turkey, to reconstitute or revise her internal polity, and maintain her independence, what folly it is to continue fighting against the power that you are going into partnership with; and how absurd in the extreme it is to continue the siege of Sebastopol, which will never solve the difficulty, but must envenom the state with which you are to share the protectorate, and which is also the nearest neighbour of the power for which you interpose, and your efforts to reorganise which, even if there be a chance of your accomplishing that object, she has the greatest means of thwarting! Would it not be far better for you to allow this question to be settled by peace than to leave it to the arbitrement of war, which cannot advance its adjustment one inch?

I have already adduced an illustration from the history of this country, as an inducement for your returning to peace. I will mention another. We all remember the war with America, into which we entered in 1812, on the question of the right of search, and other cognate questions relating to the rights of neutrals. Seven years before that war was declared, public opinion and the statesmen of the two countries had been incessantly disputing upon the questions at issue, but nothing could be amicably settled respecting them, and war broke out. After two years of hostilities, however, the negotiators on both sides met again, and fairly arranged the terms of peace. But how did they do this? Why, they agreed in their treaty of peace not to allude to what had been the subject-matter of the dispute which gave rise to the war, and the question of the right of search was never once touched on in that treaty. The peace then made between England and America has now lasted for forty years; and what has been the result? In the meantime, America has grown stronger, and we, perhaps, have grown wiser, though I am not quite so sure of that. We have now gone to war again with a European power, but we have abandoned those belligerent rights about which we took up the sword in 1812. Peace solved that difficulty, and did more for you than war ever could have done; for, had you insisted at Ghent on the American people recognising your right to search their ships, take their seamen, and seize their goods, they would have been at war with you till this hour, before they would have surrendered these points, and the most frightful calamities might have been entailed on both countries by a protracted struggle.

Now apply this lesson to the Eastern question. Supposing you agree to terms of peace with Russia, you will have your hands full in attempting to ameliorate the social and political system of Turkey. But who knows what may happen

with regard to Russia herself in the way of extricating you from your difficulty? That difficulty, as respects Russia, is no doubt very much of a personal nature. You have to deal with a man of great, but, as I think, misguided energy, whose strong will and indomitable resolution cannot easily be controlled. But the life of a man has its limits; and, certainly, the Emperor of Russia, if he survive as many years from this time as the duration of the peace between England and America, will be a most extraordinary phenomenon. You can hardly suppose that you will have a great many years to wait before, in the course of nature, that which constitutes your chief difficulty in the present war may have passed away. It is because you do not sufficiently trust to the influence of the course of events in smoothing down difficulties, but will rush headlong to a resort to arms, which never can solve them, that you involve yourselves in long and ruinous wars. I never was of opinion that you had any reason to dread the aggressions of Russia upon any other state. If you have a weak and disordered empire like Turkey, as it were, next door to another that is more powerful, no doubt that tends to invite encroachments; but you have two chances in your favour—you may either have a feeble or differently-disposed successor acceding to the throne of the present Czar of Russia, or you may be able to establish some kind of authority in Turkey that will be more stable than its present rule. At all events, if you effect a quintuple alliance between yourselves and the other great powers, you will certainly bind Austria, Prussia, and France to support you in holding Russia to the faithful fulfilment of the proposed treaty relating to the internal condition of Turkey. Why not, then, embrace that alternative instead of continuing the present war? because, recollect that you have accomplished the object which her Majesty in her gracious speech last session stated that she had in view in engaging in this contest. Russia is no longer invading the Turkish territory; you are now rather invading Russia's own dominions, and attacking one of her strongholds at the extremity of her empire, but, as I contend, not assailing the real source of her power. Now, I say you may withdraw from Sebastopol without at all compromising your honour.

By-the-by, I do not understand what is meant when you say that your honour is staked on your success in any enterprise of this kind. Your honour may be involved in your successfully rescuing Turkey from Russian aggression; but, if you have accomplished that task, you may withdraw your forces from before Sebastopol without being liable to reproach for the sacrifice of your national honour.

I have another ground for trusting that peace would not be again broken, if you terminate hostilities now. I believe that all parties concerned have received such a lesson, that they are not likely soon to rush into war again. I believe that the Emperor of Russia has learnt, from the courage and self-relying force displayed by our troops, that an enlightened, free, and self-governed people is a far more formidable antagonist than he had reckoned upon, and that he will not so confidently advance his semi-barbarous hordes to cope with the active energy and inexhaustible resources of the representatives of Western civilisation. England also has been taught that it is not so easy as she imagined to carry on war upon land against a state like Russia, and will weigh the matter well in future before she embarks in any such conflict. . . .

Now, what do you intend to do if your operations before Sebastopol should fail? The Secretary at War tells us that "Sebastopol must be taken this campaign, or it will not be taken at all." If you are going to stake all upon this one throw of the dice, I say that it is more than the people of England themselves had calculated upon. But if you have made up your minds that you will have only one campaign against Sebastopol, and that. if it is not taken then, you will abandon it, in that case, surely, there is little that stands between you and the proposals for peace on the terms I have indicated.

I think you will do well to take counsel from the hon. member for Aylesbury [Mr Layard], than whom—although I do not always agree with him in opinion—I know nobody on whose authority I would more readily rely in matters of fact relating to the East. That hon. gentleman tells you that Russia will soon have 200,000 men in the Crimea; and if this be so, and this number is only to be "the beginning," I should say, now is the time, of all others, to accept moderate proposals for peace.

Now, mark, I do not say that France and England cannot succeed in what they have undertaken in the Crimea. I do not set any limits to what these two great countries may do, if they persist in fighting this duel with Russia's force of 200,000 men in the Crimea; and, therefore, do not let it be said that I offer any discouragement to my fellow-countrymen; but what I come back to is the question—what are you likely to get that will compensate you for your sacrifice? The hon. member for Aylesbury also says, that "the Russians will, next year, overrun Asiatic Turkey, and seize Turkey's richest provinces"—they will probably extend their dominion over Asia Minor down to the sea-coast. The acquisition of these provinces would far more than compensate her for the loss of Sebastopol. I suppose you do not contemplate making war upon the plains in the interior of Russia, but wish to destroy Sebastopol; your success in which I have told you, I believe, will only end in that stronghold being rebuilt, ten years hence or so, from the resources of London

capitalists. How, then, will you benefit Turkey—and especially if the prediction is fulfilled regarding Russia's overrunning the greater portion of Asiatic Turkey? I am told, also, that the Turkish army will melt away like snow before another year; and where, then, under all these circumstances, will be the wisdom or advantage in carrying on the war?

I have now, sir, only one word to add, and that relates to the condition of our army in the Crimea. We are all, I dare say, constantly hearing accounts, from friends out there, of the condition, not only of our own soldiers, but also of the Turks, as well as of the state of the enemy. What I have said about the condition of the Turks will, I am sure, be made as clear as daylight, when the army's letters are published and our officers return home. But as to the state of our own troops, I have in my hand a private letter from a friend in the Crimea, dated the 2d of December last, in which the writer says:

"The people of England will shudder when they read of what this army is suffering—and yet they will hardly know one-half of it. I cannot imagine that either pen or pencil can ever depict it in its fearful reality. The line, from the nature of their duties, are greater sufferers than the artillery, although there is not much to choose between them. I am told, by an officer of the former, not likely to exaggerate, that one stormy, wet night, when the tents were blown down, the sick, the wounded, and the dying of his regiment, were struggling in one fearful mass for warmth and shelter."

Now, if you consult these brave men, and ask them what their wishes are, their first and paramount desire would be to fulfil their duty. They are sent to capture Sebastopol, and their first object would be to take that strong fortress, or perish in the attempt. But, if you were able to look into the hearts of these men, to ascertain what their longing, anxious hope has been, even in the midst of the bloody struggle at Alma or at Inkerman, I believe you would find it has been, that the conflict in which they were engaged might have the effect of sooner restoring them again to their own hearths and homes. Now, I say that the men who have acted so nobly at the bidding of their country are entitled to that country's sympathy and consideration; and if there be no imperative necessity for further prosecuting the operations of the siege, which must—it will, I am sure, be admitted by all, whatever may be the result—be necessarily attended with an immense sacrifice of precious lives—unless, I say, you can show that some paramount object will be gained by contending for the mastery over those forts and ships, you ought to encourage her Majesty's Government to look with favour upon the propositions which now proceed from the enemy; and then, if we do make mistakes in accepting moderate terms of peace, we shall, at all events, have this consolation, that we are erring on the side of humanity.

LORD LYTTON.

1805-1873.

ADDRESS TO THE ASSOCIATED SOCIETIES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

[On the occasion of his installation as their honorary president. Delivered in the Queen Street Hall, 18th January 1854.]

Gentlemen,—I may well feel overcome by the kindness with which you receive me, for I cannot disentangle my earliest recollections from my sense of intellectual obligations to the genius of Scotland. The first poets who charmed me from play in the half-holidays of school were Campbell and Scott—the first historians who clothed, for me, with life, the shadows of the past, were Robertson and Hume—the first philosopher who, by the grace of his attractive style, lured me on to the analysis of the human mind, was Dugald Stewart—and the first novel that I bought with my own money, and hid under my pillow, was the "Roderick Random" of Smollett. So, when later, in a long vacation from my studies at Cambridge, I learned the love for active adventure, and contracted the habit of self-reliance by solitary excursions on foot, my staff in my hand and my knapsack on my shoulders, it was towards Scotland that I instinctively bent my way, as if to the nursery-ground from which had been wafted to my mind the first germs of those fertile and fair ideas which, after they have come to flower upon their native soil, return to seed, and are carried by the winds we know not whither, calling up endless diversities of the same plant, according to the climate and the ground to which they are borne by chance.

Gentlemen, this day I visited, with Professor Aytoun, the spot on which, a mere lad, obscure and alone, I remember to have stood one starlight night in the streets of Edinburgh, gazing across what was then a deep ravine, upon the

picturesque outlines of the Old Town, all the associations which make Scotland so dear to romance, and so sacred to learning, rushing over me in tumultuous pleasure; her stormy history, her enchanting legends—wild tales of witchcraft and fairyland—of headlong chivalry and tragic love—all contrasting, yet all uniting, with the renown of schools famous for patient erudition and tranquil science—I remember how I then wished that I could have found some tie in parentage or blood to connect me with the great people in whose capital I stood a stranger. That tie which birth denied to me, my humble labours, and your generous kindness, have at last bestowed; and the stranger in your streets stands to-day in this crowded hall, proud to identify his own career with the hopes and aspirations of the youth of Scotland.

Gentlemen, when I turn to what the analogous custom of other universities renders my duty upon this occasion, and offer some suggestions that may serve as hints in your various studies, I feel literally overshadowed by the awe of the great names, all your own, which rise high around me in every department of human progress. It is not only the illustrious dead before whom I have to bow—your wonted fires do not live only in their ashes. The men of to-day are worthy the men of yesterday. A thousand rays of intellectual light are gathered and fused together in the varied learning of your distinguished Principal. The chivalry of your glorious annals finds its new Tyrtæus in the vigorous and rushing verse of Professor Aytoun. Your medical schools, in all their branches—pathology, medical jurisprudence, surgery, anatomy, chemistry—advance more and more to fresh honours under the presiding names of Simpson, Alison, Christison, Goodsir, Traill, Syme, and Gregory.* The general cause of education itself is identified with the wide repute of Professor Pillans. Nature has added the name of Forbes to the list of those who have not only examined her laws but discovered her secrets—while the comprehensive science of Sir William Hamilton still corrects and extends the sublime chart that defines the immaterial universe of ideas. And how can I forget the name of one man, whose character and works must have produced the most healthful influence over the youth of Scotland—combining, as they do, in the rarest union, all that is tender and graceful with all that is hardy and masculine—the exquisite poet, the vigorous critic, the eloquent discourser, the joyous comrade—the minstrel of the Isle of Palms—the Christopher North of Maga! How I wish that the plaudits with which you receive this inadequate reference to one so loved and honoured might be carried to his ears, and assure him that, like those statues of the great Roman fathers in the well-known passage of Tacitus—if he be absent from the procession he is still more remembered by the assembly. And since I see around me many who, though not connected with your college, are yet interested in the learned fame of your capital, permit me on this neutral ground to suspend all differences of party, and do homage to the great orator and author, whose luminous genius, whose scholastic attainments, whose independence of spirit, whose integrity of life, so worthily represent not only the capital, but the character of the people who claim their countryman by descent in Macaulay. When I think of those names, and of many more which I might cite, if time would allow me to make the catalogue of your living title-deeds to fame, I might well shrink from the task before me; but as every man assists to a general illumination by placing a single light at his own window, so, perhaps, my individual experience may contribute its humble ray to the atmosphere which genius and learning have kindled into familiar splendour.

Gentlemen, I shall first offer some remarks upon those fundamental requisites which, no matter what be our peculiar studies, are essential to excellence in all of them. Nature indicates to the infant the two main elements of wisdom—nature herself teaches the infant to observe and to inquire. You will have noticed how every new object catches the eye of a young child—how intuitively he begins to question you upon all that he surveys—what it is? what it is for? how it came there? how it is made? who made it? Gradually, as he becomes older, his observation is less vigilant, his curiosity less eager. In fact, both faculties are often troublesome and puzzling to those about him. He is told to attend to his lessons, and not ask questions to which he cannot yet understand the replies. Thus his restless vivacity is drilled into mechanical forms, so that often when we leave school we observe less and inquire less than when we stood at the knees of our mother in the nursery. But our first object on entering upon youth, and surveying the great world that spreads before us, should be to regain the earliest attributes of the child. What were the instincts of the infant are the primary duties of the student. His ideas become rich and various in proportion as he observes—accurate and practical in proportion as he inquires. The old story of Newton observing the fall of the apple, and so arriving, by inquiry, at the laws of gravity, will occur to you all. But this is the ordinary process in every department of intelligence. A man observes more attentively than others had done something in itself very simple. He reflects, tests his observation by inquiry, and becomes the discoverer, the inventor; enriches a science, improves a manufacture, adds a new beauty to the arts, or, if engaged in pro-

* Of this list Sir R. Christison (1877) is the only survivor.

fessional active life, detects, as a physician, the secret cause of disease—extracts truth, as a lawyer, from contradictory evidence—or grapples, as a statesman, with the complicated principles by which nations flourish or decay. In short, take with you into all your studies this leading proposition, that, whether in active life or in letters and research, a man will always be eminent according to the vigilance with which he observes, and the acuteness with which he inquires. But this is not enough—something more is wanted—it is that resolute effort of the will which we call perseverance. I am no believer in genius without labour; but I do believe that labour, judiciously and continuously applied, becomes genius in itself. Success in removing obstacles as in conquering armies, depends on this law of mechanics—the greatest amount of force at your command concentrated on a given point. If your constitutional force be less than another man's, you equal him if you continue it longer and concentrate it more. The old saying of the Spartan parent to the son who complained that his sword was too short, is applicable to everything in life—"If your weapon is too short, add a step to it." Dr Arnold, the famous Rugby schoolmaster, said the difference between one boy and another was not so much in talent as in energy. It is with boys as with men; and perseverance is energy made habitual. But I forget that I am talking to Scotchmen; no need to preach energy and perseverance to them. Those are their national characteristics. Is there a soil upon earth from which the Scotchman cannot wring some harvest for fortune? or one field of honourable contest on which he has not left some trophy of renown?

We must now talk a little upon books. Gentlemen, the objects and utilities of reading are so various, that to suggest any formal rules whereby to dictate its subjects and confine its scope, would be to resemble the man in a Greek anecdote, who, in order to improve his honey, cut off the wings of his bees, and placed before them the flowers his own sense found the sweetest. No doubt, the flowers were the best he could find on Hymettus; but, somehow or other, when the bees had lost their wings, they made no honey at all. Still, while the ordinary inducement to reading is towards general delight and general instruction, it is well in youth to acquire the habit of reading with conscientious toil for a special purpose. Whatever costs us labour braces all the sinews of the mind in the effort; and whatever we study with a definite object, fixes a much more tenacious hold on the memory than do the lessons of mere desultory reading. If, for instance, you read the history of the latter half of the last century, simply because some works on the subject are thrown in your way; unless your memory be unusually good, you will retain but a vague recollection, that rather serves to diminish ignorance than bestow knowledge. But suppose, in a debating society, that the subject of debate be the character of Charles Fox, or the administration of Mr Pitt, and some young man gets up the facts of the time for the special purpose of making an ample and elaborate speech on the principles and career of either of those statesmen, the definite purpose for which he reads, and the animated object to which it is to be applied, will, in all probability, fix what he reads indelibly in his mind; and to the dry materials of knowledge will be added the *virida vis* of argument and reasoning. You see now, then, how wisely the first founders of learning established institutions for youth on the collegiate principle; fixing the vague desire for knowledge into distinct bounds, by lectures on chosen subjects, and placing before the ambition of the student the practical object of honourable distinction—a distinction, indeed, that connects itself with our gentlest affections, and our most lasting interests: for honours gained in youth pay back to our parents, while they are yet living, some part of what we owe to their anxiety and care. And whatever renown a university can confer, abridges the road to subsequent success, interests our contemporaries in our career, and raises up a crowd eager to cheer on our first maturer efforts to make a name. The friendships we form at college die away as life divides us, but the honours we gain there remain and constitute a portion of ourselves. Who, for instance, can separate the fame of a Brougham or a Mackintosh from the reputation they established at the university at Edinburgh? The variety of knowledge embraced in the four divisions, which are here called faculties, allows to every one an ample choice, according to the bias of each several mind, or the profession for which the student is destined. But there is one twofold branch of humane letters in which the universities of Scotland are so renowned that I must refer to it specially, though the reference must be brief—I mean moral and metaphysical philosophy, which, in Edinburgh especially, has been allied to the Graces by the silver style of Dugald Stewart, and taken the loveliness which Plato ascribes to virtue from the beautiful intellect of Brown. Now, it would be idle to ask the general student to make himself a profound metaphysician. You might as well ask him to make himself a great poet. Both the one and the other are born for their calling; not made by our advice, but their own irresistible impulse. But a liberal view of the principal theories as to the formation of the human mind, and the latent motives of human conduct, is of essential service to all about to enter upon busy practical life. Such studies quicken our perceptions of error and virtue, enlarge our general knowledge of mankind, and enable our later experience to apply with order and method the facts it accumulates. I need not remind those who boast the great name of Chalmers, or who heard the lec-

ture of your Principal two years ago, that moral philosophy is the handmaid of divinity. She is also the sister of jurisprudence, and the presiding genius of that art in which you are so famous; and which, in order to heal the body, must often prescribe alternatives to the mind—more especially in these days, when half our diseases come from the neglect of the body in the overwork of the brain. In this railway age the wear and tear of labour and intellect go on without pause or self-pity. We live longer than our forefathers, but we suffer more from a thousand artificial anxieties and cares. They fatigued only the muscles; we exhaust the finer strength of the nerves; and, when we send impatiently to the doctor, it is ten to one but what he finds the acute complaint, which is all that we perceive, connected with some chronic mental irritation, or some unwholesome inveteracy of habit. Here, then, the physician, accustomed to consider how mind acts upon body, will exercise with discretion the skill that moral philosophy has taught him. Every one knows the difference between two medical attendants, perhaps equally learned in pharmacy and the routine of the schools; the one writes in haste the prescription we may as well "throw to the dogs;" the other, by his soothing admonitions, his agreeable converse, cheers up the gloomy spirits, regulates the defective habits, and often, unconsciously to ourselves, "ministers to the mind diseased, and plucks from the memory a rooted sorrow." And the difference between them is, that one has studied our moral anatomy, and the other has only looked on us as mere machines of matter, to be inspected by a peep at the tongue, and regulated by a touch of the pulse. And in order to prove my sense of the connection between moral and metaphysical philosophy and practical pathology, and to pay a joint compliment to the two sciences for which your college is so pre-eminent, I here, as a personal favour to myself, crave permission of the heads and authorities of the university to offer the prize of a gold medal, for the current year, for the best essay by any student on some special subject implying the connection I speak of, which may be selected in concert with the various professors of your medical schools, and the professors of metaphysics and moral philosophy.

Gentlemen, allow me to preface the topic to which I now turn, by congratulating you on the acquisition your scholarship has recently made in the accomplished translator of Æschylus, Professor Blackie—who appears to have thrown so much light on the ancient language of the Greeks by showing its substantial identity with the modern. I now proceed to impress on you the importance of classical studies. I shall endeavour to avoid the set phrases of declamatory panegyric which the subject too commonly provokes. But if those studies appear to you cold and tedious, the fault is in the languor with which they are approached. Do you think that the statue of ancient art is but a lifeless marble? Animate it with your own young breath, and instantly it lives and glows. Greek literature, if it served you with nothing else, should excite your curiosity as the picture of a wondrous state of civilisation which, in its peculiar phases, the world can never see again, and yet from which every succeeding state of civilisation has borrowed its liveliest touches. If you take it first as a mere record of events—if you examine only the contest between the Spartans and the Athenians—the one as the representative of duration and order, the other of change and progress, both pushed to the extreme—there instantly rise before you, in the noblest forms—through the grandest illustrations of history—through the collision of characters at once human and heroic—there instantly, I say, rise before you lessons which may instruct every age, and which may especially guide the present. For so closely does Grecian history bear on the more prominent disputes in our own day, that it is not only full of wise saws, but still more of modern instances. I pass by this view of the political value of Grecian literature, on which I could not well enlarge without, perhaps, provoking party differences, to offer some remarks, purely critical, and for which I bespeak your indulgence if I draw too largely on your time. Every professor who encourages the young to the study of the classics will tell them how these ancient masterpieces have served modern Europe with models to guide the taste and excite the emulation. But here let us distinguish what we should mean when we speak of them as models—we mean no check to originality—no cold and sterile imitation, more especially of form and diction. The pith and substance of a good English style—be it simple and severe, be it copious and adorned—must still be found in the nervous strength of our native tongue. We need not borrow from Greek or Roman the art that renders a noble thought transparent to the humblest understanding, or charms the fastidious ear with the varying music of elaborate cadence. The classic authors are models in a more comprehensive sense. They teach us less how to handle words than how to view things; and first, let us recognise the main characteristic of the literature of Greece. The genius of Greek letters is essentially social and humane. Far from presenting us with a frigid and austere ideal, it deals with the most vivid passions, the largest interests common to the mass of mankind. In this sense of the word it is practical—that is, it connects itself with the natural feelings, the practical life of man under all forms of civilisation. That is the reason why it is so durable—it fastens hold of sympathy and interest in every nation and every age. Thus Homer is immeasurably the most popular poet the world

ever knew. The Iliad is constructed from materials with which the natural human heart has the most affinity. Our social instincts interest us on both sides, whether in the war of the Greeks avenging the desecration of the marriage hearth, or the doom of the Trojans, which takes all its pathos from the moment we see Hector parting from Andromache, and unbinding his helmet that it may not terrify his child. Homer makes no attempt at abstract subtle feelings with which few can sympathise. He takes terror and pity from the most popular springs of emotion—valour, love, patriotism, domestic affections—the struggle of man with fate—the contrast, as in Achilles, between glorious youth and early death—between headlong daring and passionate sorrow; the contrast, as in Priam, between all that gives reverence to the king and all that moves compassion for the man. Homer knows no conventional dignity; his heroes weep—his goddesses scold—Mars roars with pain when he is wounded—Hector himself knows fear, and we do not respect him the less, though we love him more, when his heart sinks and his feet fly before Achilles. So essentially human is Homer, that it is said that he first created the Greek gods—that is, he clothed what before were vague phantoms with attributes familiar to humanity, and gave them the power of divinities, with the forms and the hearts of men.

Civilisation advances, but the Greek literature still preserves this special character of humanity, and each succeeding writer still incorporates his genius with the actual existence and warm emotions of the crowd. Æschylus strides forth from the field of Marathon, to give voice to the grand practical ideas that influenced his land and times. He represents the apotheosis of freedom, and the dawn of philosophy through the mists of fable. Thus, in the victory hymn of "the Persæ," he chants the defeat of Xerxes; thus, in the "Seven before Thebes," he addresses an audience still hot from the memories of war, in words that rekindle its passions and re-echo its clang; thus, again, in the wondrous myth of the "Prometheus Bound," he piles up the fragments of primæval legend with a Titan's hand, storming the very throne of Zeus with assertions of the liberty of intellectual will, as opposed to the authority of force. In Æschylus there is always the very form and pressure of an age characterised by fierce emotions, and the tumult of new ideas struggling for definite expression. Sophocles no less commands an everlasting audience by genial sympathy with the minds that thought, and the hearts that beat, in his own day. The stormy revolution of thought that succeeded the Persian war had given way to a milder, but not less manly, period of serene intelligence. The time had come in which what we call "The Beautiful" developed its ripe proportions. A sentiment of order, of submission to the gods—a desire to embellish the social existence secured by victorious war—pervaded the manners, and inspired the gentle emulation. All this is reflected in the calm splendour of Sophocles. It seems a type of the difference between the two that Æschylus—a bearded man—had fought at Marathon, and Sophocles—in the bloom of youth—had tuned his harp to the pæans that circled round the trophies of Salamis. The Prometheus of Æschylus is a vindication of human wisdom, made with the sublime arrogance of a Titan's pride. The Œdipus of Sophocles teaches its nothingness to wisdom, and inflicts its blind punishment upon pride. But observe how both these great poets inculcate the sentiment of mercy as an element of tragic grandeur, and how they both seek to connect that attribute of humanity with the fame of their native land. Thus it is to Athens that the Orestes of Æschylus comes to expiate his parricide—it is the tutelary goddess of the Athenians that pleads in his cause, and reconciles the Furies to the release of their hunted victim. But still more impressively does Sophocles inculcate and adorn this lesson of beautiful humanity. It is not only amidst the very grove of the Furies that Œdipus finds the peaceful goal of his wanderings—but round that grove itself the poet has lavished all the loveliest images of his fancy. There, in the awful ground of the ghastly sisters, the nightingales sing under the ivy—there blooms the narcissus—there smiles the olive—there spring the fountains that feed Cephisus. Thus terror itself he surrounds with beauty, and the nameless grave of the outlawed Œdipus becomes the guardian of the benignant state, which gave the last refuge to his woes.

A few years more, and a new phase of civilisation develops itself in Athens. To that sentiment for the beautiful which in itself discovers the good, succeeds the desire to moralise and speculate. The influence of women on social life is more admitted—statesmen and sages gather round Aspasia—love occupies a larger space in the thoughts of men, and pity is derived from gentler, perhaps from more effeminate, sources. This change Euripides—no less practical than his predecessors in representing the popular temper of his age—this change, I say, Euripides comes to depict in sententious aphorisms, in scholastic casuistry, accompanied, however, with the tenderest pathos, and enlisting that interest for which he is ridiculed by Aristophanes—the interest derived from conjugal relations and household life—the domestic interest—it is this which has made him of all the Greek dramatists the most directly influential in the modern stage. And it is Euripides who has suggested to the classic tragedy of Italy and France two-thirds of whatever it possesses of genuine tenderness and passion. In a word, the Greek drama is not that marble perfection of artistic symmetry which it has too often been represented to be, but a flesh and blood creation,

identifying itself with the emotions most prevalent in the multitudes it addressed, and artificial rather by conventions derived from its religious origin than by any very deep study of other principles of art than those which sympathy with human nature teaches instinctively to the poet. The rules prescribed to the Greek dramatist, such as the unities, were indeed few, and elementary, belonging rather to the commencement of art than to its full development. There are few critics nowadays, for instance, who will not recognise a higher degree of art in Shakespeare, when he transports his willing audience over space and time, and concentrates in Macbeth the whole career of guilty ambition, from its first dire temptation to its troubled rise and its bloody doom, than there can be in any formal rule which would have sacrificed for dry recital the vivacity of action, and crowded into a day what Shakespeare expands throughout a life.

In fine, then, these Greek poets became our models—not as authorities for pedantic laws, not to chill our invention by unsubstantial ideals or attempts to restore to life the mere mummies of antiquity—but rather, on the contrary, to instruct us that the writer who most faithfully represents the highest and fairest attributes of his own age has the best chance of an audience in posterity; and that whatever care we take as to the grace or sublimity of diction, still the diction itself can only be the instrument by which the true poet would refine or exalt what? why, the feelings most common to the greatest number of mankind. We have heard too much about the calm and repose of classic art. It is the distance from which we take our survey that does not allow us to distinguish its force and its passion. Thus the rivulet, when near, seems more disturbed than the ocean beheld afar off. At the distance of two thousand years, if we do not see all the play of the waves, it is because we do not stand on the beach. The same practical identification with the intellectual attributes of their age which distinguished the poetry, no less animates the prose of the ancient Greeks. The narratives of Herodotus, so simple yet so glowing, were read to immense multitudes—now exciting their wonder by tale and legend—now gratifying their curiosity by accounts of barbarian customs—now inflaming their patriotism by minute details of the Persian myriads that exhausted rivers on their march, and graphic anecdotes of the Grecian men, whom the Medes at Marathon saw rushing into the midst of their spears, or whom the scout of Xerxes found dressing their hair for the festival of battle in the glorious pass of Thermopylæ. No less does the graver mind of Thucydides represent the intense interest with which the Grecian intellect was accustomed to view the action and strife, the sorrow and triumph, of the human beings, from whom it never stood superciliously aloof. Though the father of philosophical history, Thucydides knows nothing of that cynical irony which is common to the modern spirit of historical philosophy in its cold survey of the follies and errors of mankind. He never neglects to place full before you whatever ennobles our species, whether it be the lofty sentiment of Pericles or the hardy valour of Brasidas. It is his candid sympathy with whatever in itself is good and great which vivifies his sombre chronicle, and renders him at once earnest yet impartial. Each little bay or creek, each defile or pass, where gallant deeds have been done, he describes with the conviction that the deeds have hallowed the place to all posterity, and have become a part of that κτῆμα ες ἀει which he proposed to bequeath. This is the spirit which returns to life in your own day, and in your own historians, which gives a classic charm to the military details of Napier, and lights with a patriot's fire the large intelligence and profound research that immortalise the page of Alison.

Pass from history to oratory. All men in modern times, famous for their eloquence, have recognised Demosthenes as their model. Many speakers in our own country have literally translated passages from his orations, and produced electrical effects upon sober English senators by thoughts first uttered to passionate Athenian crowds. Why is this? Not from the style—the style vanishes in translation—it is because thoughts the noblest appeal to emotions the most masculine and popular. You see in Demosthenes the man accustomed to deal with the practical business of men—to generalise details, to render complicated affairs clear to the ordinary understanding—and, at the same time, to connect the material interests of life with the sentiments that warm the breast and exalt the soul. It is the brain of an accomplished statesman in unison with a generous heart, thoroughly in earnest, beating loud and high—with the passionate desire to convince breathless thousands how to baffle a danger, and to save their country.

A little time longer, and Athens is free no more. The iron force of Macedon has banished liberty from the silenced Agora. But liberty had already secured to herself a gentle refuge in the groves of the Academy—there, still to the last, the Grecian intellect maintains the same social, humanising, practical aspect. The immense mind of Aristotle gathers together, as in a treasure-house for future ages, all that was valuable in the knowledge that informs us of the earth on which we dwell—the political constitutions of states, and their results on the character of nations, the science of ethics, the analysis of ideas, natural history, physical science, critical investigation, *omne immensum peragravit;* and all that he collects from wisdom he applies to the earthly uses of man. Yet it is not by the tutor of Alexander, but by the pupil

of Socrates, that our vast debt to the Grecian mind is completed. When we remount from Aristotle to his great master, Plato, it is as if we looked from nature up to nature's God. There, amidst the decline of freedom, the corruption of manners—just before the date when, with the fall of Athens, the beautiful ideal of sensuous life faded mournfully away—there, on that verge of time stands the consoling Plato, preparing philosophy to receive the Christian dispensation, by opening the gates of the infinite, and proclaiming the immortality of the soul. Thus the Grecian genius, ever kindly and benignant, first appears to awaken man from the sloth of the senses, to enlarge the boundaries of self, to connect the desire of glory with the sanctity of household ties, to raise up in luminous contrast with the inert despotism of the old Eastern world—the energies of freemen, the duties of citizens; and, finally, accomplishing its mission as the visible Iris to states and heroes, melts into the rainbow, announcing a more sacred covenant, and spans the streams of the heathen Orcus with an arch lost in the Christian's heaven.

I have so exhausted your patience in what I have thus said of the Grecian literature, that I must limit closely my remarks upon the Roman. And here, indeed, the subject does not require the same space. In the Greek literature all is fresh and original; its very art is but the happiest selection from natural objects, knit together with the zone of the careless Graces. But the Latin literature is borrowed and adopted; and, like all imitations, we perceive at once that it is artificial—but in this imitation it has such exquisite taste, in this artificiality there is so much refinement of polish, so much stateliness of pomp—that it assumes an originality of its own. It has not found its jewels in native mines, but it takes them with a conqueror's hand, and weaves them into regal diadems. Dignity and polish are the especial attributes of Latin literature in its happiest age; it betrays the habitual influence of an aristocracy, wealthy, magnificent, and learned. To borrow a phrase from Persius—its words sweep along as if clothed with the toga. Whether we take the sonorous lines of Virgil or the swelling periods of Cicero, the easier dignity of Sallust, or the patrician simplicity of Cæsar, we are sensible that we are with a race accustomed to a measured decorum, a majestic self-control, unfamiliar to the more lively impulse of small Greek communities. There is a greater demarcation between the intellect of the writer and the homely sense of the multitude. The Latin writers seek to link themselves to posterity rather through a succession of select and well-bred admirers than by cordial identification with the passions and interests of the profane vulgar. Even Horace himself, so brilliant and easy, and so conscious of his *monumentum ære perennius*, affects disdain of popular applause, and informs us, with a kind of pride, that his satires had no vogue in the haunts of the common people. Every bold schoolboy takes at once to Homer, but it is only the fine taste of the scholar that thoroughly appreciates Virgil; and only the experienced man of the world who discovers all the delicate wit, all the exquisite urbanity of sentiment, that win our affection to Horace in proportion as we advance in life. In short, the Greek writers warm and elevate our emotions as men—the Latin writers temper emotions to the stately reserve of high-born gentlemen. The Greeks fire us more to the inspirations of poetry, or (as in Plato and parts of Demosthenes) to that sublimer prose to which poetry is akin; but the Latin writers are, perhaps, on the whole, though I say it with hesitation, safer models for that accurate construction and decorous elegance by which classical prose attains critical perfection. Nor is this elegance effeminate, but, on the contrary, nervous and robust, though, like the statue of Apollo, the strength of the muscle is concealed by the undulation of the curves. But there is this, as a general result from the study of ancient letters, whether Greek or Roman—both are the literature of grand races, of free men and brave hearts; both abound in generous thoughts and high examples; both, whatever their occasional licence, inculcate, upon the whole, the habitual practice of manly virtues; both glow with the love of country; both are animated by the desire of fame and honour. Therefore, whatever be our future profession and pursuit, however they may take us from the scholastic closet, and forbid any frequent return to the classic studies of our youth, still he whose early steps have been led into that land of demi-gods and heroes will find that its very air has enriched through life the blood of his thoughts, that he quits the soil with a front which the Greek has directed towards the stars, and a step which imperial Rome has disciplined to the march that carried her eagles round the world.

Not in vain do these lessons appeal to the youth of Scotland. From this capital still, as from the elder Athens, stream the lights of philosophy and learning. But your countrymen are not less renowned for the qualities of action than for those of thought. And you whom I address will carry with you, in your several paths to fortune, your national attributes of reflective judgment and dauntless courage. I see an eventful and stirring age expand before the rising generation. In that grand contest between new ideas and ancient forms, which may be still more keenly urged before this century expires, whatever your differences of political opinion, I adjure you to hold fast to the vital principle of civilisation. What is that principle? It is the union of liberty with order. The art to preserve this union has often baffled

the wisest statesmen in stormy times; but the task becomes easy at once, if the people whom they seek to guide will but carry into public affairs the same prudent consideration which commands prosperity in private business. You have already derived from your ancestors an immense capital of political freedom; increase it if you will—but by solid investments, not by hazardous speculations. You will hear much of the necessity of progress, and truly; for where progress ends decline invariably begins; but remember that the healthful progress of society is like the natural life of man—it consists in the gradual and harmonious development of all its constitutional powers, all its component parts, and you introduce weakness and disease into the whole system, whether you attempt to stint or to force the growth. The old homely rule you prescribe to the individual is applicable to a state—"Keep the limbs warm by exercise, and keep the head cool by temperance." But new ideas do not invade only our political systems; you will find them wherever you turn. Philosophy has altered the directions it favoured in the last century—it enters less into metaphysical inquiry; it questions less the relationships between man and his Maker; it assumes its practical character as the investigator of external nature, and seeks to adapt agencies before partially concealed to the positive uses of man. Here I leave you to your own bold researches; you cannot be much misled, if you remember the maxim, to observe with vigilance, and inquire with conscientious care. Nor is it necessary that I should admonish the sons of religious Scotland that the most daring speculations as to nature may be accompanied with the humblest faith in those sublime doctrines that open heaven alike to the wisest philosopher and the simplest peasant. I do not presume to arrogate the office of the preacher; but, believe me, as a man of books, and a man of the world, that you inherit a religion which, in its most familiar form, in the lowly prayer that you have learned from your mother's lips, will save you from the temptations to which life is exposed more surely than all which the pride of philosophy can teach. Nor can I believe that the man will ever go very far or very obstinately wrong who, by the mere habit of thanksgiving and prayer, will be forced to examine his conscience even but once a day, and remember that the eye of the Almighty is upon him.

One word further. Nothing, to my mind, preserves a brave people true and firm to its hereditary virtues more than a devout though liberal spirit of nationality. And it is not because Scotland is united with England that the Scotchman should forget the glories of his annals, the tombs of his ancestors, or relax one jot of his love for his native soil. I say not this to flatter you—I say it not for Scotland alone. I say it for the sake of the empire. For sure I am that, if ever the step of the invader should land upon these kindred shores—there, wherever the national spirit is the most strongly felt—there, where the local affections most animate the breast—there will our defenders be the bravest. It would ill become me to enter into the special grounds of debate now at issue; but permit me to remind you that, while pressing with your accustomed spirit for whatever you may deem to be equal rights, you would be unjust to your own fame if you did not feel that the true majesty of Scotland needs neither the pomp of courts nor the blazonry of heralds. What though Holyrood be desolate—what though no king holds revels in its halls—the empire of Scotland has but extended its range; and, blended with England, under the daughter of your ancient kings, peoples the Australian wilds that lay beyond the chart of Columbus, and rules over the Indian realms that eluded the grasp of Alexander. That empire does not suffice for you. It may decay—it may perish. More grand is the domain you have won over human thought, and identified with the eternal progress of intellect and freedom. From the charter of that domain no ceremonial can displace the impression of your seal. In the van of that progress no blazon can flaunt before that old Lion of Scotland [pointing to the flag suspended opposite]. This is the empire that you will adorn in peace; this is the empire that, if need be, you will defend in war. It is not here that I would provoke one difference in political opinion—but surely you, the sons of Scotland, who hold both fame and power upon the same tenure as that which secures civilisation from lawless force—surely you are not the men who could contemplate with folded arms the return of the dark ages, and quietly render up the haven that commands Asia on the one side and threatens Europe on the other, to the barbaric ambition of some new Alaric of the north. But, whether in reluctant war or in happier peace, I can but bid you to be mindful of your fathers—learn from them how duties fulfilled in the world become honours after death; and in your various callings continue to maintain for Scotland her sublime alliance with every power of mind that can defend or instruct, soothe or exalt humanity.

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE.

1805-1872.

ON THE FRIENDSHIP OF BOOKS.*

I HAVE proposed to speak to you this evening on the Friendship of Books. I have some fear that an age of reading is not always favourable to the cultivation of this friendship. I do not mean that we are in any special danger of looking upon them as enemies. That is no doubt the temptation of some persons. I have known both boys and men who have looked at books with a kind of rage and hatred, as if they were the natural foes of the human species. I am far from thinking that these were bad boys or bad men; nor were they stupid. Some of them I have found very intelligent, and have learnt much from them. I could trace the dislike in some cases to a cause which I thought honourable. The dogs and horses which they did care about, and were always on good terms with, they regarded as living creatures, who could receive affection, and in some measure could return it. Their horses could carry them over hills and moors; their dogs had been out with them from morning till night, and took interest in the pursuit that was interesting them. Books seemed to them dead things in stiff bindings, that might be patted or caressed ever so much, and would take no notice, that knew nothing of toil or pleasure, of hill or stubble-field, of sunrise or sunsetting, of the earnest chase or the feast after it. Was it not better to leave them in the shelves which seemed to be made for them? Was it not treating them most respectfully not to finger or soil them, but to secure the services of a housemaid who should occasionally dust them?

I frankly own that I have great sympathy with these feelings, and with those who entertain them. If books are only dead things, if they do not speak to one, or answer one when one speaks to them, if they have nothing to do with the common things that we are busy with —with the sky over our head, and the ground under our feet—I think that they had better stay on the shelves; I think any horse or dog, or tree or flower, is a better companion for human beings than they are. And therefore I say again, it is not with those who count them enemies that I find fault. They have much to say for themselves; if their premises are right they are right in their conclusions. What I regret is, that many of us spend much of our time in reading books, and in talking of books —that we like nothing worse than the reputation of being indifferent to them, and nothing better than the reputation of knowing a great deal about them; and yet that, after all, we do not know them in the same way as we know our fellow-creatures, not even in the way we know any dumb animal that we walk with or play with. This is a great misfortune, in my opinion, and one which I am afraid is increasing as what we call "the taste for literature" increases. I cannot enter into all the different reasons which lead me to think so, nor can I trace the evil to its source. But I will mention one characteristic of the reading in our times, which must have much to do with it.

A large part of our reading is given to reviews, and magazines, and newspapers. Now I am certain that these must have a very important use. We should all of us be trying to find out what the use of them is, because it is clear that we are born into an age in which they exercise great power; and that fact must bring a great responsibility not only upon those who wield the power, but upon us who have to see that it does us good, and not hurt. But whatever good effects works of this kind may have produced, we certainly are not able to make them our friends. Perhaps you will wonder that I should say that a newspaper or a review is a much less awful thing than a quarto or a folio—I mean, of course, to those who are not going themselves to be cut up in it, but only to have the pleasure of seeing their friends and neighbours cut up. Moreover, the writer of the newspaper or magazine or review, commonly assumes an off-hand, dashing air. He has a number of colloquial phrases and stock jests which seem intended to put us at our ease. He speaks in a loud, rattling tone, like one who wishes to shake hands the first time you meet him. But then, when you stretch out your hand, what is it you meet? Not that of a man, but of a shadow, of something that calls itself "We." Be friends with a "We!" How is that possible? If the mist is scattered, if we discover that there is an actual human being there, then the case is altered altogether. If Lord Jeffrey, or Mr Macaulay, or Sir James Stephen publishes articles which he has written in a review, with his name affixed to them, or if a "*Times* correspondent" whom, in our superstition, we had supposed to be one of the fairies or genii that descend from some other world to

* Delivered first at Ellesmere, at the request of Archdeacon Allen, in the autumn of 1856; afterwards at Harrow. This and the following given by permission of Messrs Macmillan & Co.

our planet, appears with an ordinary name, and dressed like a mortal, why, then we feel we are on fair terms. A person is presenting himself to us, one who may have a right to judge us, but who is willing to be tried himself by his peers. That, you see, is because the *We* has become an *I*. All his apparent dignity is dissolved; we can recognise him as a fellow-creature.

Now, I do not say this the least in condemnation of reviewers, or of any person who, for any reasons whatever, thinks it better to call himself *We* than *I*. I only say that there is no *friendship* under such conditions as this; that we never can make any book our friend until we look upon it as the work of an *I*. It is the principle which I hope to maintain throughout this lecture, and therefore I begin with stating it at once. I want to speak to you about a few books which exhibit very transparently, I think, what sort of a person he was who wrote them, which show *him* to us. I think we shall find that there is the charm of the book, the worth of the book. He may be writing about a great many things; but there is a man who writes; and when you get acquainted with that man, you get acquainted with the book. It is no more a collection of letters and leaves; it is *a friend*.

I mean to speak entirely, or almost entirely, of English books. And I shall begin with a writer who seems to offer a great exception to the remark I have just made. If I thought he was really an exception, I should be much puzzled, or rather I should give up my position altogether. For, since he is the greatest and the best known of all English authors, for him to be an instance against me would be a clear proof that I was wrong. We continually hear this observation, "William Shakespeare is not to be found in any of his plays." It is his great and wonderful distinction that he is not. Othello speaks his word, Hamlet his, Bottom the Weaver his; Desdemona, Imogen, Portia, each her word. But Shakespeare does not intrude himself into any of their places; he does not want us to know what he thought about this matter or that. If you look into one corner or another for him, he is not there. It would appear, then, according to my maxim, as if Shakespeare could never be his reader's friend. It would appear as if he were the great precedent for all newspaper writers and reviewers, as if he were overlooking mankind just as they do, and had the best possible right to describe himself as a *We*, and not as an *I*.

Well, that sounds very plausible, and, like everything that sounds plausible, there is a truth at the bottom of it. But that the truth is not this, I think the feeling and judgment of the people of England (I might say of the continents of Europe and of America) might convince you, without any arguments of mine. For they have been so sure that there was a William Shakespeare, they were so certain that he had a local habitation and a name, that they have rummaged parish registers, hunted Doctors' Commons for wills, made pilgrimages to Stratford-upon-Avon, put together traditions about old houses and shops, that they might make, if possible, some clear image of him in their minds. I do not know that they have succeeded very well. The facts of his biography are few. A good deal of imagination has been needed to put them together, and to fill up the blanks in them. I do not suppose registers, or wills, or old houses, will give many more answers concerning him. But that only shows, I think, how very clear a witness his own works give, even when the outward information is ever so scanty, of the man that he was, and of the characteristics which distinguished him from his fellows. If you ask me how I reconcile this assertion with the undoubted fact that he does not put himself forward as other dramatists do, and give his own opinions instead of allowing the persons of his drama to utter theirs, I should answer, Have you found that the man who is in the greatest hurry to tell you all that he thinks about all possible things, is the friend that is best worth knowing? Have you found that the one who talked most about himself and his own doings is the most worth knowing? Do you not generally become rather exhausted with men of his kind? Do not you say sometimes, in Shakespeare's own words, or rather in Falstaff's, "I do see to the bottom of this same Justice Shallow; he has told me all he has to tell. There is no reserve in him, nothing that is worth searching after?" On the other hand, have you not met with some men who very rarely spoke about their own impressions and thoughts, who seldom laid down the law, and yet who you were sure had a fund of wisdom within, and who made you partakers of it by the light which they threw on the earth in which they were dwelling, especially by the kindly, humorous, pathetic way in which they interested you about your fellow-men, and made you acquainted with them? I do not say that this is the only class of friends which one would wish for. One likes to have some who in quiet moments are more directly communicative about their own sufferings and struggles. But certainly you would not say that men of the other class are not very pleasant, and very profitable. Of this class Shakespeare is the most remarkable specimen. Instead of being a reviewer who sits above the universe, and applies his own narrow rules to the members of it, he throws himself with the heartiest and most genial sympathy into the feelings of all, he understands their position and circumstances, he perceives how each must have been effected by them. Instead of being a big, imaginary *We*, he is so much of a man himself that he can enter into the manhood of people who are the furthest off from him, and with whom he has the least to do. And so, I be-

lieve, his books may become most valuable friends to us—to us especially who ought to be acquainted with what is going on with all kinds of people. Every now and then, I think (especially, perhaps, in the characters of Hamlet and of Prospero), one discovers signs how Shakespeare as an individual man had fought and suffered. I quite admit, however, that his main work is not to do this, but to help us in knowing ourselves—the past history of our land, the people we are continually meeting. And any book that does this is surely a friend.

Before I leave Shakespeare, I would speak of the way in which he made friends with books. Perhaps I can do it best by comparing his use of them with the use which was made of them by a very clever and accomplished contemporary of his. Ben Jonson, though he was the son of a bricklayer, made himself a thoroughly good Latin and Greek scholar. He read the best Latin books, and the commentaries which illustrated them; he wrote two plays on subjects taken from Roman history. Very striking subjects they were. The hero of one was Catiline, who tried to overthrow the social order of the republic; the hero of the other was Sejanus, who represents, by his grandeur and his fall, the very character and spirit of the empire in the days of Tiberius. In dealing with these subjects, Ben Jonson had the help of two of the greatest Roman authors, both of them possessing remarkable powers of narration, one of them a man of earnest character, subtle insight, deep reflection. Though few men in his day understood these authors, and the government and circumstances of Rome, better than Jonson though he was a skilful and experienced playwriter, most readers are glad when they have got Catiline and Sejanus fairly done with. They do not find that they have received any distinct impressions from them of Roman life; to learn what it was they must go to the authors whom he has copied. Shakespeare wrote three plays on Roman subjects—"Coriolanus," "Julius Cæsar," "Antony and Cleopatra." He knew very little of Latin, and the materials he had to work with were a tolerable translation of "Livy's History," and a capital one of "Plutarch's Lives." With no aid but these, and his knowledge of Warwickshire peasants, and London citizens, he has taught us more of Romans—he has made us more at home in their city, and at their fireside, than the best historians who lived upon the soil are able to do. Jonson studied their books; Shakespeare made *friends* of them. He did just the same with our old chronicles. He read of King John, of Richard II., of John of Gaunt, of Harry of Lancaster, of Hotspur and Owen Glendower, of the good Humphrey of Gloucester and the dark Cardinal Beaufort, of Wolsey and Catherine. He read of them, and they stood up before him, real armed men, or graceful, sorrowing women. Instead of being dead letters, they all became living persons; not appearing in solitary grandeur, but forming groups; not each with a fixed immovable nature, but acted upon and educated by all the circumstances of their times; not dwelling in an imaginary world, but warmed by the sun of Italy, or pinched by the chilly nights of Denmark—essentially men such as are to be found in all countries and in all ages, and therefore exhibiting all the varieties of temperament and constitution which belong to each age, and to each country.

Shakespeare's mind was formed in an age when men were at work, and when they wanted books to explain and illustrate their work. He lived on into another, when men began to value books for their own sakes. James I., who was called a Solomon (and who would have deserved that name if Solomon had not considered that his wisdom was given him that he might rule his subjects well, and if James had not supposed that his was given for every purpose except that), was the great promoter of this worship of books. But they did not speak to Englishmen of that which was going on around them, as they had done in Elizabeth's time. Learned people drew a line about themselves, and signified to common people who had business that they must keep their distance. Still there were many influences which counteracted this tendency. One man, who was not free from it by any means, helped to check it by opening to his fellows a new and real world. Lord Bacon found that they knew the secrets of nature only through books, that they did not come freely and directly into contact with them; he showed them how they might converse with the things they saw, how they might know them as they were in themselves, instead of only seeing them distorted by their spectacles. That was a great work to do; and as I said, it was never more wanted than just at this time, when men were in danger of falling so much in love with the letters in books as to forget into what a universe of mysteries God had put His creature man that he might search them out. Bacon reverenced the study of nature more than he did the study of man; and no wonder! For he found out what a beautiful order there was in nature; and though I believe he looked for an order in human affairs too, and sometimes discerned, and always wished for it, yet there is no denying than he had a keen eye for the disorders and wrong-doings of his fellowmen, and that he rather reconciled himself to them than sought to remedy them. I refer to him, because I fancy that many have a notion of his books on the interpretation of nature as very valuable for scientific men, and his books on morals and politics as very wise for statesmen and men of the world, but not as friends. They form this notion because they suppose that the more we knew of Bacon himself, the

less sympathy we should have with him. I should be sorry to hold this opinion, because I owe him immense gratitude; and I could not cherish it if I thought of him, even as the sagest of book-makers, and not as a human being. I should be sorry to hold it, because if I did not find in him a man who deserved reverence and love, I should not feel either the indignation or the sorrow which I desire to feel for his misdoings. Niebuhr said of Cicero that he knew his faults as well as anybody, but that he felt as much grieved when people spoke of them as if he were his brother. That is the right way to feel about great men who are departed, and I do not think that an Englishman should feel otherwise about Bacon. It is hard to measure the exact criminality of his acts; one of the truest sentences ever passed on them was his own. His words are faithful transcripts of both his strength and weakness. There are some, especially of his dedications, which one cannot read without a sense of burning shame; there are passages in the very treatises which those dedications introduce that it does one's heart good to remember, and which we are inwardly sure must have come from the heart of him who put them into language. He does not give us at all the genial impressions of other men which Shakespeare gives, but he detects very shrewd tricks which we practise upon ourselves. His worldly wisdom is what we have most to dread, lest he should make us contented with the wrong in ourselves, and in the society about us, and should teach us to admire low models. But if we apply to our moral pursuits the zeal for truth, and the method of seeking it and of escaping from our own conceits, which he imparts to us in his physical lessons, if we consider his own errors, and his punishment for tolerating and embracing the base maxims of his time, we shall find him all the safer as a guide because we have felt with him as a friend. When we do that we can always appeal from the man to himself; we can say: "Thank you heartily for what you have said to me; but there were clouds about you when you were here; you did not always walk with straight feet, and with your eyes turned to the light. Now you know better, and I will make use of what you tell me, as well as of all that I can learn about your doings, as warnings to keep me from wandering to the right or to the left."

I might speak of other books in this bookish time of James I., which many of us have found valuable and genial friends; as for instance the poems of George Herbert, which nobody that ever reads them can think of merely as poems; they are so completely the utterances of the heart of an affectionate, faithful, earnest man, they speak so directly to whatever is best in ourselves, and give us such friendly and kindly admonitions about what is worst. But I must go on to the next period, which was a period of action and strife, when men could no more regard writing books, or even reading them, as an amusement; when the past must be studied for the sake of the present, or not at all. John Milton belongs to that time. He was the most learned of all our poets, the one who from his childhood upwards was a devourer of Greek and Latin books, of the romances of the Middle Ages, of French and Italian poetry, above all of the Hebrew Scriptures. All these became his friends; for all of them connected themselves with the thoughts that occupied men in his own time, with the deep religious and political controversies which were about to bring on a civil war. Many persons think that the side which he took in that war must hinder us from making his books our friends; that we may esteem him as a great poet, but that we cannot meet him cordially as a man. No one is more likely to entertain that opinion than an English clergyman, for Milton dealt his blows unsparingly enough, and we come in for at least our full share of them. I know all that, and yet I must confess that I have found him a friend, and a very valuable friend, even when I have differed from him most and he has made me smart most. It does not strike me that on the whole we profit most by the friends who flatter us. We may be stirred up to the recollection of our duty by those who speak stern and terrible words of us, and of our class. If we are persuaded that they are utterly wrong in condemning the institutions to which we are attached, we may often admit that they are very right in condemning us for the sins which hinder men from seeing the worth of those institutions. I do not know any one who makes us feel more than Milton does the grandeur of the ends which we ought to keep always before us, and therefore our own pettiness and want of courage and nobleness in pursuing them. I believe he failed to discern many of the intermediate relations which God has established between Himself and us; but I know no one who teaches us more habitually, that disobedience to the Divine will is the seat of all misery to men. I would rather converse with him as a friend than talk of him as a poet; because then we put ourselves into a position to receive the best wisdom which he has to give us, and that wisdom helps to purge away whatever dross is mingled with it; whereas if we merely contemplate him at a distance as a great genius, we shall receive some powerful influence from him, but we shall not be in a condition to compare one thing that he says to us with another. And to say the truth, I do not know what genius is, except it be that which begets some life in those who come in contact with it, which kindles some warmth in them. If there is genius in a poem, it must have been first in the poet; and if it was in the poet, it must have been because he was not a stock or a stone, but a breathing and suffering

man. And there is no writer whose books more force upon us the thought of him as a person than Milton's. There are few passages in his prose writings, full as they are of gorgeous passages, more beautiful than that in which he defends himself from the charge of entering from choice or vanity into controversies, by alleging the far different object and kind of writing to which from his youth upwards he had desired to devote himself. And in his latest poem of "Samson Agonistes," where what he had learnt from the play-writers of Greece is wonderfully raised, and mellowed, and interpreted by what he had learnt from the Old Testament, he himself speaks to us in every line. He transfers himself to the prison of Samson in Gaza; he is the blind, downcast, broken man whom God appears to have cast off. The thought of God as the Deliverer gives him a consolation which nothing else can give; he looks forward to some triumph which God will give to his race, as the only hope for himself.

I have dwelt some time upon these "friends" because Shakespeare, Bacon, Milton, are the greatest names in our literature, and therefore it was important for my purpose to show you that *their* books do fulfil the purpose which I have said all books ought to fulfil. I might very fairly have gone back, and spoken to you of older writers than these. I might have spoken of the time of our Edward III., and have given you some proofs that our first poet, Chaucer, was a cordial, genial, friendly man, who could tell us a great many things which we want to know about his own time, and could also break down the barrier between his time and ours, and make us feel that, though our dress may be very much unlike theirs, and our houses a good deal better, and our language a little less French, yet that on the whole our fathers worked at much the same trades as we do, fell into the same kind of sins, looked up at the same skies, had the same wants in their hearts, and required that they should be satisfied in the same way. I might have spoken to you also of some of the men who flourished at the time of the Reformation—of Latimer for instance, whose broad, simple, humorous sermons address themselves to all the common sympathies of Englishmen, and are as free from starch and buckram as any one could wish.* I might have spoken to you also of some of Shakespeare's contemporaries, especially of that delightful and instructive companion, Spenser's "Faery Queen," which makes us feel that without stepping a yard from our native English ground, or deserting any of our common occupations, we may be, ay, and must be, engaged in a great fight with invisible enemies, and that we have invisible champions on our side. But as I have not time to speak of many books to-night, I have passed over these, and have begun at once with those which, for one reason or another, people are most likely to think of as having claims upon their respect rather than upon their friendship. That must be my reason too for not dwelling upon a book belonging to Milton's time, which many people would at once recognise as a delightful friend; I mean Izaak Walton's "Angler." Knowing nothing of his craft, I should only betray my ignorance by entering upon it, and should lessen the pleasure which some of you, I dare say, have received from its quiet descriptions and devout reflections. But I am glad to remember that there is such a book in our libraries, even if I understand very little of it, because it is one of the links between the life of the woods and streams and the life of the study, which it would be a great misfortune for us to lose.

A link between this age and the one that follows it is found in Thomas Fuller, one of the liveliest, and yet, in the inmost heart of him, one of the most serious writers one can meet with. I speak of this writer partly because there is no one who is so resolute that we should treat him as a friend, and not as a solemn dictator. By some unexpected jest, or comical turn of expression, he disappoints your purpose of receiving his words as if they were fixed in print, and asserts his right to talk with you, and convey his subtle wisdom in his own quaint and peculiar dialect.

Fuller uses his wit to make his reader a friend. The writers of Charles II.'s court used their wit to prove that there could be no such thing as friendship with either books or men, that it was altogether a ridiculous obsolete sentiment. They established their point so far as they themselves were concerned; one has no right to ask of them what they had not to give. But their punishment is a singular one. They wished to pass for men of the world, and not for vulgar bookwrights. We are obliged to regard them as bookwrights simply, and not as men at all. There is one exception. John Dryden stands apart from the men whose vices infected him, not merely because his style in prose and verse was immeasurably more vigorous than theirs, but because his confused life, and his evil companions, did not utterly destroy his heart. I do not know that one could make the writings of John Dryden friends; so many of the very cleverest of them are bitter satires, containing a great deal of shrewd observation, sometimes just, as well as severe, but certainly not binding us by any strong ties of affection to their author. Yet there is such a tragedy in the history of a mind so full of power as his, and so unable to guide itself amidst the shoals and quicksands of his time, that I believe we need not, and that we cannot speak of him merely with the admiration which is due to his gifts; we must feel for him somewhat of the pity that is akin to love.

* For an example see p. 9.

Mr Macaulay charges Dryden with changing his religion chiefly that he might get a pension from James II. I do not believe that was his motive, or that the lesson from his life would be worth as much as it is if it had been. If we compare his "Religio Laici" which he wrote in his former, with his "Hind and Panther" which expressed his later opinions, I think we may perceive that his mind was unhinged, that he found nothing fixed or certain in heaven or earth, and that he drifted naturally wherever the tide of events carried him. That is the fate which may befall many who have no right to be described as mercenary time-servers.

However, one is glad to escape from this age, which had become a very detestable one, and to find ourselves in one which, though not exemplary for goodness, produced books of which we can very well make friends. If you take up the *Spectator*, or the *Guardian*, your first feeling is that the writers in it wish to cultivate your friendship. They have thrown off the stiff manners of those who reckon it their chief business to write books; at the same time they do not affect to be men of the world despising books. Their object is to bring books and people of the world into a good understanding with each other; to make fine ladies and gentlemen somewhat wiser and better behaved by feeding them with good and wholesome literature; to show the student what things are going on about him, that he may not be a mere pedant and recluse. I do not mean that this was the deliberate purpose of Addison and Steele. It was the natural effect of their position that they took this course. They had been educated as scholars; they entered into civil life, and became Members of Parliament. The two characters were mixed in them, and when they wrote books they could not help showing that they knew something of men. The two men were well fitted to work together. Addison had the calmer and clearer intellect; he had inherited a respect for English faith and morality. Steele, with a more wavering conduct, had perhaps even more reverence in his inmost heart for goodness. Between them they appeared just formed to give a turn to the mind of their age; not presenting to society a very heroical standard, but raising it far above the level to which it had sunk, and is apt to sink.

The *Spectator* and the *Guardian* have sometimes been called the beginning of our periodical literature. Perhaps they are; but they are very unlike what we describe by that name in our day. There is no *We* in them. Though the papers have letters of the alphabet, and not names, put to them, and though they profess to be members of a club, each writer calls himself *I*. You can hardly conceive what a difference it would make in the pleasure with which you read any paper, if the singular pronoun were changed for the plural. The good humour of the writing would evaporate immediately. You would no longer find that you were in the presence of a kindly, friendly observer, who was going about with you, and pointing out to you this folly of the town, and that pleasant characteristic of a country gentleman's life. All would be the dry, hard criticism of some distant being, who did not take you into his counsels at all, but merely told you what you were to think or not to think. And with the good humour, what we call the *humour* when we do not prefix the adjective to it, would also disappear. Mr Thackeray, the most competent person possible for such a task, has introduced Addison and Steele among the *humourists* of England, and has shown very clearly both how the humour of the one differed from that of the other, and how unlike both were to Dean Swift, who is the best and most perfect specimen of ill humour—that is to say, of a man of the keenest intellect and the most exquisite clearness of expression, who is utterly out of sorts with the world and with himself. Addison is on good terms with both. He amuses himself with people, not because he dislikes them, but because he likes them, and is not discomposed by their absurdities. He does not go very far down into the hearts of them; he never discovers any of the deeper necessities which there are in human beings. But everything that is upon the surface of their lives, and all the little cross-currents which disturb them, no one sees so accurately, or describes so gracefully. In certain moods of our mind, therefore, we have here a most agreeable friend, one who tasks us to no great effort, who does not set us on encountering any terrible evils, or carrying forward any high purpose, but whom one must always admire for his quietness and composure; who can teach us to observe a multitude of things that we should else pass by, and reminds us that in man's life, as in nature, there are days of calm and sunshine as well as of storm.

But though one may have a very pleasant and useful conversation with this kind-hearted *Spectator* now and then, I do not think that such conversation would brace one to the hard work of life, or would enable one to sympathise with those who are engaged in it. We must remember that a very considerable majority of the world do not ride in coaches, as nearly all those we read of in the *Spectator* do; that to earn bread by the sweat of the brow is the common heritage of the sons of Adam, and that it is a great misfortune not to understand *that* necessity, even if circumstances have exempted us from it. For that reason some of us may welcome another friend, far less happy and genial than Addison, often very rough and cross-grained, with rude inward affection. Old Samuel Johnson had none of Addison's soft training. He had nothing to do with the House of Commons, except as a contraband reporter; he had not the remotest chance of being a Secretary of State even if he

had not been a fierce Tory, and in the reign of George II. all but a Jacobite. With only booksellers for his patrons, obliged to seek his bread from hand to mouth by writing for them what they prescribed, with a bad digestion, a temper anything but serene, a faith certainly as earnest as Addison's, but which contemplated its objects on the dark and not on the sunny side, he offers the greatest contrast one can conceive to the happy well-conditioned man of whom I have just been speaking. The opposition between them is all the more remarkable because the *Rambler* was formed on the model of the *Spectator*, and because Johnson as much as Addison belongs to what ought to be called the club period of English literature. I do not suppose any one will be bold enough to vindicate that name, be it good or evil, for our day, merely because gentlemen are now able to eat solitary dinners, hear news, and sleep over newspapers and magazines, in very magnificent houses in Pall Mall. The genuine club, though its locality might be in some dark alley out of Fleet Street, was surely that in which men of different occupations after the toil of the day met to exchange thoughts. In that world Johnson flourished even more than Addison. The latter is accused by Pope of giving his little senate laws; but Johnson's senate contained many great men who yet listened to his oracles with reverence. And those oracles were not delivered in sentences of three clauses ending in a long word in "tion,' like those papers in the *Rambler* which are so well parodied in the "Rejected Addresses." I think that young men ought undoubtedly to be early warned of these pompous sentences, not because it is worse to imitate this style than any other—for we have no business to imitate any (our style must be our own, or it is worth nothing)—but because it is particularly easy to catch this habit of writing, and to fancy there is substance when there is only wind. But I cannot admit that Johnson's most inflated sentences contain mere wind. He had something to put into them; they did express what he felt, and what he was, better than simpler, more English, more agreeable ones would have done. He adopted them naturally; they are part of himself; if we want to be acquainted with him, we must not find fault with them. And when he is describing scenes, as in "Rasselas, Prince of Abyssinia," he is often quite free and picturesque; when he is writing about business, as in his "Falkland Island," he does not let his eloquence, which in that book is often very splendid, hinder him from being pointed and direct in his blows. He falls into what some people call King Cambyses' vein chiefly when he is moralising on the condition of the world, and the disappointment of all man's hopes and projects in it. In his club, no one could speak with more straightness, wasting no words, but bringing out the thing he wants to say in the strongest and most distinct dress that could be found. One may not agree in half of the opinions he expresses, and may think that he delivers them very dogmatically. If one looked either at his writings or at Boswell's life of him merely as books, one would go away very discontented and very angry; but when one thinks of both as exhibiting to us a man, the case becomes altogether different. We are all greatly indebted, I think, to Mr Carlyle, for having determined that we should contemplate Johnson in this way, and not chiefly as a critic or a lexicographer. We may judge of him in those characters very differently; but in himself Mr Carlyle has shown most clearly that he deserves our sympathy and our reverence.

There were two members of Johnson's club to each of whom he was sincerely attached, and who were attached to each other, though in their habits, occupations, talents, modes of thinking, they were as unlike him, and unlike each other, as any two men could be. They had, indeed, a common origin—Oliver Goldsmith and Edmund Burke were both Irishmen. But Goldsmith carried his country about with him wherever he went; he was always blundering, and reckless, and good-natured. Burke only showed where he had been born by his zeal for the improvement of his country whenever its affairs came under discussion. I believe that these two men, with the vast differences that there are between them, may both become our friends, and that we shall not thoroughly enjoy the "Deserted Village," or the "Vicar of Wakefield," or the "Speeches on American Taxation,"* or the "Reflections on the French Revolution," unless they do. All Goldsmith's friends were always scolding him, laughing at him, and learning from him. They found that he had a fund of knowledge which he had picked up they could not tell how, but apparently by sympathising with all the people that he came into contact with, and so getting to be really acquainted with them. He compiled histories without much learning about the people he was writing of; yet he did not make them false or foolish, because he had more notion than many diligent historians have of what men must be like in any latitudes. In his poetry he never goes out of his depth; he speaks of things which he has seen and felt himself, and so it tells us of him if it does not tell us of much else. In spite of all his troubles he is as good-natured as Addison; only he mixed with a different class of people from Addison, and can tell us of country vicars and their wives and daughters, though he may not know much of a Sir Roger de Coverley. His books, I think, must be always pleasant, as well as profitable friends, provided we do not expect from them, as we ought not to expect from any friend, more than they profess to give.

* Pp. 174-222.

Burke is a friend of another order. Johnson said of him that if you met him under a gateway in a shower of rain you must perceive that he was a remarkable man. I do not think we can take up the most insignificant fragment of the most insignificant speech or pamphlet he ever put forth without arriving at the same conviction. But he does what is better than make us acknowledge him as a remarkable man. He makes us acknowledge that we are small men, that we have talked about subjects of which we had little knowledge, and the principles of which we had imperfectly sounded.

He told the electors of Bristol that they might reject him if they pleased, but that he should maintain his position as an English statesman and an honest man. They did reject him, of course, but his speech remains as a model for all true men to follow, as a warning to all who adopt another course, that they may make friends for the moment, but that they will not have a friend in their own conscience, and that their books, if they leave any, will be no friends to those who read them in the times to come.

Away from the club in which Johnson, Burke, and Goldsmith were wont to meet, in a little village in Buckinghamshire, dwelt another poet, who was not uninterested in their doings, and who had in his youth mixed with London wits. William Cowper inspired much friendship among men, and still more among women, during his lifetime; they found him the pleasantest of all companions in his bright hours, and they did not desert him in his dark hours. His books have heen friends to a great many since he left the earth, because they exhibit him very faithfully in both; some of his letters and some of his poems being full of mirth and quiet gladness, some of them revealing awful struggles and despair. Whatever estimate may be formed of his poetry in comparison with that of earlier or later writers, every one must feel that his English is that of a scholar and a gentleman—that he had the purest enjoyment of domestic life, and of what one may call the domestic or still life of nature. One is sure also that he had the most earnest faith, which he cherished for others when he could find no comfort in it for himself. These would be sufficient explanations of the interest which he has awakened in so many simple and honest readers who turn to books for sympathy and fellowship, and do not like a writer at all the worse because he also demands their sympathy with him. Cowper is one of the strongest instances, and proofs, how much more qualities of this kind affect Englishmen than any others. The gentleness of his life might lead some to suspect him of effeminacy; but the old Westminster schoolboy and cricketer comes out in the midst of his "Meditation on Sofas;" and the deep tragedy which was at the bottom of his whole life, and which grew more terrible as the shadows of evening closed upon him, shows that there may be unutterable struggles in those natures which seem least formed for the rough work of the world. In one of his later poems he spoke of himself as one

> "Who, tempest-tossed, and wrecked at last,
> Comes home to port no more."

But his nephew, who was with him on his death-bed, says that there was a look of holy surprise on his features after his eyes were closed, as if there were very bright visions for him behind the veil that was impenetrable to him here.

I have thus given you a few hints about the way in which books may be friends. I have taken my examples from the books which are most likely to come in our way; and I have chosen them from different kinds of authors, that I may not impose my own tastes upon other people. I purposely avoid saying anything about more recent writers, who have lately left the world or are in it still, because private notions and prejudices for or against the men are likely to mingle with our thoughts of their books. I do not mean that this is not the case with the older writers too. I think I have shown you that I have no wish to forget the men in the books—that my great desire is that we should connect them together. But if we have known anything about the writers, or our fathers have known anything about them, if we have heard their acts and words gossiped about, they are not such good tests of the way in which we may discern them in their books, and learn what they are from their books. But as I began this lecture with some animadversions upon the tendency of one part of our popular literature to weaken our feeling that books are our friends, I ought to say that I am very far indeed from thinking that this is the effect which the more eminent writers among us produce. In their different ways, I believe most of them have addressed themselves to our human sympathies, and have claimed a place for their books, not upon our shelves, but in our hearts. Of some, both prose writers and poets, this is eminently true. Perhaps, from feeling the depressing influence of the *We*-teaching upon all our minds, they have taken even overmuch pains to show that each one of them comes before us as an *I*, and will not meet us upon any other terms. Many, I hope, who have established this intercourse with us will keep it with our children and our children's children, and will leave books that will be regarded as friends as long as the English language lasts, and in whatever regions of the earth it may be spoken.

It is very pleasant to think in what distant parts of the earth it is spoken, and that in all those parts these books which are friends of ours are acknowledged as friends. And there is a living and productive power in them. They have produced an American literature, which is coming back to instruct us. They will produce

by-and-by an Australian literature, which will be worth all the gold that is sent to us from the diggings.

American books have of late asserted very strongly their right to be reputed as our friends, and we have very generally and very cordially responded to the claim. I refer to one book now—Mrs Stowe's "Dred," though I did not mean to notice any contemporary book at all—for the sake of certain passages in it which I think that none that have read them can have forgotten. They are those in which the authoress describes the effects which were produced upon a very simple-hearted and brave negro—whose whole life had been one of zealous self-devotion to some white children, but who had had no book teaching whatsoever—by the stories which were read to him out of the Old and New Testaments. We are told with great simplicity and with self-evident truth, how every one of these stories started to life in his mind, how every person who is spoken of in them came forth before the hearer as an actual living being, how his inmost soul confessed the book as a reality and as *a friend*. No lesson, I think, is more suited to our purpose. It shows us what injury we do to the Book of Books when we regard it as a book of letters, and not as a book of life; none can bear a stronger witness to us how it may come forth as *the* Book of Life, to save all others from sinking into dryness and death. I have detained you far too long in endeavouring to show you how every true book exhibits to us some man, from whose mind its thoughts have issued, and with whom it brings us acquainted. May I add this one word in conclusion?—that I believe all books may do that for us, because there is one Book which, besides bringing into clearness and distinctness a number of men of different ages from the creation downwards, brings before us one Friend, the chief and centre of all, who is called there *The Son of Man*.

EDMUND BURKE.*

Edmund Burke was a man of letters as well as a statesman. Other questions interested him, besides those which came under his notice in the House of Commons; what did come under his notice there, he spoke of in words which have delighted numbers who thought little of the special occasions which called them forth. I might limit myself to the consideration of him as an essayist and an orator, forgetting that he had ever argued for economical reform, or impeached Warren Hastings, or arraigned "a regicide peace." But I confess that he does not interest me chiefly as either statesmen, essayist, or orator—that I should not care for him in any of these characters if I did not perceive that he was first of all a man. I may disagree with a number of his opinions; I shall not tell you with how many I agree or disagree. But he himself, I think, is a subject worthy of all study, and of very sincere affection. That I may know him, I must get what light I can from any of his acts or discourses. Whatever names they bear, however they may be classified, they will show us something of him; it may be his weakness, it may be his strength. Only I find it a good rule, when I am contemplating a person from whom I want to learn, always to look out for his strength, being confident that the weakness will discover itself, as far as it is good for me to be aware of it, without seeking for it.

Edmund Burke was born in Dublin, in the year 1730. He was the Irishman of the last age, as the Duke of Wellington was the Irishman of this. But it was easier to guess the nationality of the first than of the second; for we assume that every Irishman is born an orator, and this is just the faculty which the great soldier did not possess. There was no early development of it in Burke. The younger Pitt is said to have been set upon a chair by his father and to have delivered speeches when he was six years of age—a story illustrating the vanity which mixed with the nobler qualities of the Earl of Chatham. Burke, to all appearance, escaped the terrible calamity of being a youthful prodigy. There are no reports, so far as I know, of any extraordinary feats that he did in the way of learning, or of any wonderful sayings that he uttered. He was sent to the school of a Mr Shackleton, a modest and sensible Quaker, who probably checked any tendency there might be in him to premature display; a good reason, if it was so, why Burke should have loved him, as we know he did, to the end of his days. This reverence for his master, and his cordial affection for his brother and several of his schoolfellows, afforded a better promise, I conceive, for the future, intellectually as well as morally, than the most rapid growth in abilities and acquisition would have done. The open-hearted, warm-hearted boy draws in nourishment from all that he sees, hears, and reads; the clever boy often gives out more than he receives.

Burke went from Mr Shackleton's school to Trinity College, Dublin. He was younger than boys at our universities are, only fourteen when he entered the college, and eighteen when he took his degree. Of those years likewise there are no very clear records. One cannot make out that he shone among his contemporaries, or that he won any conspicuous honours. But he never can have been idle, never without a purpose. He may not have framed to himself a distinct plan of his future life. Very few do that; and those who do are not always the wisest. A young man cannot predict into what circum-

* Delivered at the Bury St Edmunds Literary Society, 1857.

stances he may hereafter be thrown, or what work may be provided for him. He can be learning how men of other days have thought, and acted, and fought their way; he can be finding out what he is capable of, he can be struggling with the petty distractions and temptations of each hour. Burke may not have been making this preparation the less because his path was a quiet one. He was involved enough in the bustle of the world afterwards. It was probably just as good for him that he did not anticipate it at college, and that he did not come up to London preceded by any flourish of trumpets to tell what he was going to be.

In 1750 he was in London, at the Middle Temple. His father was an attorney, and wished him no doubt to distinguish himself at the English bar. He must have been acquiring a knowledge of law while he was in the Temple, for he showed that he had it afterwards when he became a statesman. But he does not seem to have been able to connect the study of it with the practice of it. That he declined to engage in, then. And I should imagine, from remarks he made upon lawyers afterwards, when he was drawing a spirited sketch of the character of Mr George Grenville, that the resolution was formed deliberately, and that he did not regret it. Whether he took a wiser and safer course in giving himself to literature, and in becoming a writer for periodicals, I dare not pronounce. Men are conducted in strange ways. A better wisdom than their own shapes their ends; their self-will is sometimes turned to their discipline and instruction. Certainly Burke did not avoid, as no man will, temptations and vexations by entering upon this path. He never, it would appear, had to struggle with the poverty which some of the friends whom he knew in later years encountered. He brought some money with him; he had not the recklessness which we are apt to attribute to his countrymen; the tasks which he undertook under the patronage of the booksellers were wisely selected, and proved in general prosperous. It was seven or eight years, however, before he entered upon the most judicious and successful of them, the "Annual Register;" and in the meantime he may have experienced many of the hopes deferred, the sickening disappointments, the sore struggles with the question, whether it is not well to part with a little honesty for the sake of pleasing the public, which most who give up a profession for the sake of what they suppose is the greater freedom and elevation of a literary life have to endure.

Seeing, however, that he was destined to be a politician hereafter, all this training was, I have no doubt, very profitable to him. It brought him into acquaintance with men and books together—with common men and not with fine men, with books that would enlarge the circle of his thoughts, his knowledge of other countries, and of history; not with books that would train him rapidly for a clerk or a diplomatist. He boasted in his later days, with great truth, that he was not "rocked and dandled into a legislator." This was no doubt a time when he was passing through a rough discipline, which fitted him to make laws by learning something of the men who have to obey them, possibly some of the motives which there are to break them. He learned also to feel for the necessities of authors, a lesson of which not a few received the benefits in his own prosperity.

In your town, to Suffolk men, I need mention but one instance which gives him some claim upon your gratitude and that of all Englishmen. When the poor boy of Aldborough, George Crabbe, had served his apprenticeship to a surgeon near Bury, and then at Woodbridge, and had gone to London and made application to one patron after another, it was Burke who read the MSS. and the letter of the poor youth who was walking about in despair upon Westminster Bridge and saved him from starvation to write "The Borough" and "The Tales of a Hall."

Though in one sense a servant of the booksellers, Burke was not merely doing such work as would bring in bread for the moment and then be forgotten. He made at least two permanent additions to the literature of his country. I must speak of them, because in different ways they illustrate the character of the man, and show how unlike his training for public employments was to that of most official men.

The first is entitled "A Vindication of Natural Society." This title may startle any one who is acquainted with the general purpose of Burke's life, and with the maxims for which he was contending in every part of it. No one had less respect for the condition of the savage than he had; no one was less inclined to overthrow the order of society, and reconstruct it, by dwelling on what men might have been before they entered into it. He believed that men are social beings by God's constitution, and that they cannot be good for anything when they are not living as if they were. The notions which became exceedingly popular a short time afterwards, here as well as in France, those of which Rousseau was the great champion, about the necessity of sweeping away the vices of civilisation by returning to the life of the woods, had never the slightest hold upon him; his mind, which was essentially historical, utterly rebelled against them; he scarcely did justice to that strong sense of the evils of artificial life in which they originated. How then did he care to write a "Vindication of Natural Society?" The book is a parody upon the style and

manner of Lord Bolingbroke. That writer had been very fond of maintaining that natural religion—by which he meant the religion that man discovers for himself—is all-sufficient for him; that a revelation is altogether unnecessary, and has corrupted that which existed before it. The promulgator of this opinion was an eminently refined person, a despiser of the vulgar, a man formed by, and formed for, artificial life—who played occasionally with haycocks and pitchforks with a very graceful imitation of nature, but who would have liked as ill to have abandoned his dignities and worked for his food as any one that ever existed. The wit of Burke's essay is that he supposes this very aristocratic man to maintain the advantage of a purely natural society upon the very same ground upon which he had maintained the advantages of a purely natural religion. The imitation of style was so skilful, that many are said to have been deceived by it. I cannot understand how such a mistake could have been possible for any who had the very slightest acquaintance with the designs or character of Bolingbroke. The outside resemblance only makes the internal contrast more striking. What I wish you, however, chiefly to recollect, is, that Burke did not appear in his first conspicuous work merely or chiefly as a successful jester. A parody may be very amusing; but he had as distinct and serious a purpose in this as in any of his writings. It showed, among other things, what kind of statesmen he did not admire or aspire to resemble. Bolingbroke was the most showy of all political actors as well as writers. There was none by whom a young man was more likely to be attracted. He had taken what might strike any one as a very comprehensive view of the state of parties in England. He had shown that he could adapt himself to the circumstances of the time, and be a friend of the Pretender, or of the Brunswick succession, a defender of the old country school, a liberal philosopher, each by turns, or even—so enlarged and elastic was his scheme of action—all at once. No one could utter finer or more fantastic maxims, no one had greater skill in making history illustrate what doctrines he wished it to illustrate. He was, moreover, the friend and teacher of Pope, the most popular poet of the eighteenth century, whom Burke doubtless heartily admired. There was much to captivate him in such a model; yet he was repelled, not captivated. He discerned petty spite against individuals who had injured him in the boaster of comprehensiveness; a strut and affectation and perpetual self-glorification in the would-be patriot; a want of any real reverence for men, or love of men, in the student of human actions. He appears therefore to have determined, very solemnly, that whatever guide he followed, Bolingbroke should be his beacon, and not his guide. I see much of his own after-life in this resolution, and therefore I have been more careful to speak of the book which contains the first indication of it.

The other book which Burke wrote at this time was "An Inquiry into the Origin of our Ideas on the Sublime and Beautiful." I do not propose to follow him through this inquiry, though I conceive that it is an interesting one, and that the study of this treatise, if we agree with its conclusions ever so little, will be well rewarded. But you will be inclined to exclaim, "What! did he really intend to connect himself with the affairs of the country? Was he contemplating a seat in Parliament? And did he turn aside to write a treatise on a question of taste, fit only for poets and artists?" I ought not to deny that it is a question about taste; for the introduction is entirely devoted to that subject. But his object is not to lay down certain rules or maxims as to that which we ought or ought not to like, but to find out whether there is not some ground on which our likings and dislikings rest, whether there are not some perceptions and feelings which are common to us all. All of us who are met in this room to-night have some admiration for the stupendous power of nature, have some delight in what is graceful and harmonious. There may be a great many degrees in this admiration or this delight. They may be called forth by one object in one person, by another in another. The susceptibility of such emotions as well as the power of expressing them may be much greater in some poet like Mr Wordsworth or Mr Tennyson than in any of us. But then, why is it that we like to read the poems of a man who has more of this feeling than we have ourselves? Is it not because we look upon him as our spokesman? He brings out something that was hidden in us—that we did not know was in us. He says what we should like to say if we could. He is not, then, a more special man than we are; he is more of a common man. The human sympathies have been more awakened in him than in us. If so, it may surely be possible to find out what that is in us all which receives these impressions. We need not be at the mercy of every fine gentleman who says, "That is my taste; I like this or that work of nature or of art; I call it beautiful—my opinion makes it so." But we may inquire whether there are not some principles which determine our admiration or enjoyment. We may treat men's thoughts on this subject, and the words in which they describe them, just as the chemist treats any material that falls under his analysis. . . .

I think, if you put these things together, you will agree with me that Burke may have been learning very useful lessons while he was pursuing this subject—lessons respecting his fellow-men, lessons respecting the fixed principles there

may be even in things that are most fluctuating, lessons respecting the right method of seeking for these principles. And these lessons were, I conceive, just what he would need when he became a statesman. He would then find himself amidst a number of petty interests, and of men pursuing these interests to the forgetfulness of any high and general purposes. He might easily persuade himself that human beings had in them no faculties for wondering at what is sublime, or delighting in what is beautiful. It was surely good for him to have convinced himself beforehand that they had these faculties; that such gifts were not confined to a few favourites of fortune or men of letters, but that they dwell in the hearts of peasants and handicraftsmen, ready to be called forth when once the right spring is touched. This, I take it, was a very great truth indeed for a politician to be initiated into, and one which he was much less likely to discover after he had once begun to run in the political rut. And next, as he is perpetually in the midst of the most variable and changing accidents, as the events which he may be occupied with to-day are different from those with which he was occupied yesterday, as he has to notice endless vicissitudes of tempers and motives in men, he is very likely indeed to think that all things are subjects of accidents and caprice, that there is no order in the affairs of the world at all, that they are only pedants who talk about principles. You will allow that this is a most fatal impression for any man to receive, fatal to the honesty of an individual's life, and therefore fatal to the honesty of a statesman's life. And yet how great the temptation to it must be! How much greater than we who are out of the vortex of that life can possibly conjecture! How almost impossible it must be for a man who is merely trained in diplomacy, or in managing popular assemblies, not to yield to it! But there is also the third danger, of a man becoming actually a pedant in his apparent zeal about principles, of his laying down certain rules and definitions for himself, and measuring the actions of men, the course of history, by these. So he may get himself a credit for rigidness of purpose and high consistency; yet all the while it will be a purpose of his own which he is following, not the Divine purpose. His consistency may arise from the very narrow horizon with which his sight is bounded; he may have no view to the right or the left; at last he may come to look at very little but his own shadow. That method, then, which Burke had learnt from men of science, and which he applied to questions of art, may have been of the greatest worth in showing him how he should deal with the subjects that presented themselves to him as a legislator. He was not to curb and control them by his notions and definitions; he was faithfully and laboriously, with ever fresh humility and confession of his own mistakes, to seek for the truth that was involved in them, that he might guide himself by it.

If you turn over any edition of Burke's works, you will probably find, next to the "Inquiry into the Sublime and Beautiful," two tracts: the first, "An Account of a Short Administration;" the second, "Observations on a late publication entitled 'The Present State of the Nation.'" You will be inclined to ask, How can we bridge over the chasm between works of so strangely dissimilar a kind? I have given you one or two hints which may, perhaps, help you to answer the question, so far as the topics treated of, and the way of handling them, are concerned. But, of course, the change which they indicate in the author's pursuits and modes of life needs to be explained. Much, indeed, had passed in the interval between these publications; he had gone to Bath for his health, and been married. He had written for the publisher of his essay "An Account of the European Settlements in America," and in preparing this task had acquired a far greater knowledge of English trade, and of the principles of trade generally, than belonged to his contemporaries; he had commenced a history of England; he had traced the contemporary history in the "Annual Register." Then, in the year 1759, he returned to Ireland as private secretary to William Gerard Hamilton, the chief secretary of the Lord Lieutenant. Hamilton was a man who liked reputation, and most prudently refused to risk it; he had delivered one speech in the House of Commons, and as that procured him the only advantage for which he supposed speeches are to be delivered, he never made another. He also liked patronage, and liked that those whom he patronised should be his slaves. Finding Burke an exceedingly useful slave, he wished to retain him in that character. But as Burke had a strange and ungrateful preference for freedom, he resigned the pension which Hamilton had procured for him, and returned to England. Then he became private secretary to a much juster and wiser man, the Marquis of Rockingham. He received no salary from him, and he obtained a seat in Parliament without his aid; but he was deeply and personally attached to the marquis, and it was the dismissal of his short administration in 1766 which Burke commemorated in the first pamphlet to which I alluded. That pamphlet merely enumerates in a few clear, forcible words the acts by which he judged that Lord Rockingham's ministry had deserved the gratitude of the country. He had already defended some of those acts in the House of Commons; he had probably had much to do with the suggestion and preparation of them in the closet. And now it was perceived, by men who may not have been very willing to make the discovery, that a student of principles could be a more indefatigable drudge in working out details than

those who never devoted themselves to any other business. This is a leading characteristic of Burke; and I should be losing a great moral of his career if I passed it over. You have often heard of his brilliant declamation and his inexhaustible fancy. You should never allow such phrases to make you forget that he was a more painstaking collector and methodiser of facts, that he understood statistics better, than any clerk. I do not put this statement forward as if there was anything wonderful in it. I conceive it was most natural that the man who could see most significance and order in facts and figures, should apply himself to them most vigorously and cordially. The wonder is, that those who have no human association with them, who do not see that they lead to anything or involve anything, should be able to treat them with any patience. Burke might well be diligent, for his diligence brought some reward with it—I mean the kind of reward such a man values most. It enabled him to be of some benefit to his fellow-creatures, and to see the path in which it behoved him to walk.

There were other rewards, often more coveted than these, which he did not despise, but which came to him more slowly. It was his friend Goldsmith who said about him—he was far too magnanimous to make any such complaint himself—

> "In short, 'twas his fate, unemployed or in place, sir,
> To eat mutton cold or cut blocks with a razor."

The "cold mutton" was, I doubt not, very endurable if he was really reduced to it; the "cutting blocks with a razor" points to another more curious, probably more painful experience. It is explained by the previous lines of the same poem, which describes Burke as an orator in the House of Commons:

> ". . . He went on refining,
> And thought of convincing while they thought of dining."

How it came to pass that speeches which delight and instruct those to whom the topics treated in them are comparatively obsolete should have acted as a dinner-bell to those to whom these topics were as full of the deepest interest as the Indian Mutiny is to us, has been a problem which many have undertaken to solve. Some of the solutions are certainly not satisfactory. He can scarcely have owed his unpopularity to any defects of voice or manner, for Mr Fox's stammering and spluttering are notorious, and yet he was listened to with profound attention even by those who most disliked his sentiments. It cannot have been that Burke was regarded as an adventurer; for that evil name belonged with ten times greater right to Sheridan, who was applauded to the skies. Certainly it was not the dryness of his style, for he has a power such as I should think scarcely any speaker in any age or country ever possessed, of imparting animation to the dullest topics. Nor is Goldsmith's charge of "refining" to be taken in the sense which we sometimes give to the word. He does not draw hairbreadth distinctions, or widen his arguments till the purpose of them becomes invisible. He never amuses himself or the spectators with dancing on the tight-rope, or swallowing swords, or throwing up balls and catching them. He had too much business on hand, and was too much in earnest in doing it, to indulge in any mere feats of dexterity; but he did unquestionably refine, so far as to demand attention and thought from those who never refined. His sentences were not of measured, even length, and did not terminate in some high-sounding phrase which satisfied the ear, and could be at once committed to memory for future use. He introduced whatever was necessary to the fulness of his statement, or to the elucidation of his argument, without considering whether it would serve the purpose of those who had already determined how they should vote, and who only wanted some palatable reasons which could make their consciences and their constituents understand why they had so determined. His very pains therefore to be intelligible procured him the fame of being puzzling and wearisome.

So many explanations and illustrations were needed to satisfy his own sense of the greatness of the subject, that those who had no sense of its greatness at all, who only wanted to dispose of it as quickly as they could, were of course irritated. It was very fortunate for him if they left him to a few friends and the speaker. Oftentimes they expressed their dislike much more energetically; it was not fit that so troublesome a man should make himself audible at all—the scraping of their own feet was much more agreeable to them than his voice. Such facts should be recorded for the warning and the comfort of the times to come, and it should be remembered also that many who joined in scraping down the Irish adventurer who had come to disturb their peace, began before the end of his life to think that his words, whether understood or not, were the best protectors of them and their lands.

I need not say much of the second of the pamphlets to which I referred, which was an answer to one by Mr George Grenville, though it is a valuable document for the history of the early part of the reign of George III., and though it shows how passing topics may be always made interesting to after-times, when they are connected with permanent principles. But I ought not to pass over another essay, also on an apparently temporary subject, which is named "Thoughts on the Causes of the Present Discontent." It was written in the year 1770, ten years after the accession of the sovereign. It especially refers to the scheme of government which he was said to have adopted. He was supposed to bestow his confidence not on his responsible ministers, but upon a set of persons called "king's friends," who belonged to no

school or party, who had no political maxims whatever, who merely represented the private feelings of the Court, and selected, overthrew, and reconstructed administrations according to their pleasure. It was a strong conviction of the danger of this sort of government which led Burke to maintain the use and worth of recognised parties. The "Thoughts on the Causes of the Present Discontent" is the best apology for parties, I suppose, that was ever written. It should be read with the commentary which the life of the author supplies to it. With the strongest conviction that every man ought to belong to some party, with a clearer understanding than almost any man of the party to which it was his calling to attach himself, he nevertheless was the instrument at one time of bringing the most opposite parties into union; and at another of dividing that with which for years he had been associated. I am not going to enter into the right and wrong of either of these courses, but I think they show us very clearly, first, that this party is not so practical a thing as it seems to be, since the man who could justify it best in writing was obliged to abandon it in fact; and secondly, that there must be some more sacred and divine obligation than this of party, otherwise the man who was most conscientiously, and with the most serious purpose, devoted to one, and who had most pursued principle in all his political arrangements, would scarcely have been the most remarkable instance on record, and that not once only but repeatedly, of one who breaks loose from those politics.

Perhaps the next subject which we encounter in looking through Burke's writings may show us what obligations those were, to which all petty considerations about factions must, in a mind like his, have been subordinate. He is now engaged in questions about the relation of two worlds. All the knowledge which he had acquired respecting the English settlements in North America, whilst he was a mere literary workman, was now needed to illustrate the obligations which the mother country owed to the finest and most full-grown of her children; by what arts she might expect to receive back love and obedience from her offspring. I use this language because Burke never regarded it as merely figurative language—never resorted to it merely to turn a period. The great value of all his speeches before and during the American War is, I apprehend, this, that he treats relations between countries as if they were no less real than the relations between individuals, as if they too involved affections and duties which could not be stifled or neglected without injury to one side as well as the other.

His statesmanship therefore rises above petty maxims such as men resort to who think that suspicion is the great law of life, and that the more advantages you can take of your neighbour, the better it is for yourself. The highest policy is shown to be the most humane policy, the profoundest wisdom is the most trusting wisdom. You are sure to go wrong if you tie yourself by artificial rules, and ask whether this or that act falls within the letter of them, instead of considering what it is that we expect from others, and therefore what it is that we ought to give them. This application of maxims which we allow to be generous and wise in the intercourse between man and man, to the transactions between a nation and its colonies, strikes one at first as so simple, so obvious, that we scarcely venture to call a man a profound statesman who adopts it. And yet, may not these be the deepest politics after all? May not the shallow politics be those which are made up of trick and diplomacy? May not they be always supplying new illustrations of the divine maxim, that "lying lips are but for a moment?" And may not the men who recur to plain homely laws of honesty and justice be taking us to the very foundations of things, of the laws which God Himself has established for His world?

Burke was aware of all the complications of modern life, of all the excuses which those complications supply for a tortuous system of action. But he had arrived at a deliberate conviction, from the study of history and the observation of his own time, that the more intricate all our relations to each other are, the more the evil deeds of us and our fathers have perplexed them, the more wise and necessary it is not to confute them by fresh falsehoods, but to unravel them by letting in the light of a higher truth upon them. What I once heard a benevolent physician say of a madman, "Be sure you speak only the most direct truth to him; poor fellow, his mind is confused enough already with his own false impressions," is just the doctrine which Burke was preaching to the artificial world of the eighteenth century. We are embarrassed enough with the plots, and schemes, and petty arts we have dabbled in; we have tried that road long enough; let us see whether a little plain dealing may not serve us better. It was not, as I have said already, that he wanted to return to any imaginary age of gold; he believed in no such age. He did not wish to get rid of trade and commerce, that he might restore pastoral or agricultural simplicity; he accepted trade and commerce as gifts of God, the laws of which are to be carefully pondered. He believed that in one time just as much as another, in one subject just as much as another, we are bound by laws which we did not make, which we cannot set aside, and that if we try to repeal them, and set up our own poor maxims in the place of them, they will avenge themselves upon us.

The morality which he had enforced in his speeches during the American War, he was called to exhibit in his own case in the year 1780, when he appeared before his constituents

of the city of Bristol to explain his conduct to them, and to ask for a renewal of their confidence. They had chosen him first in the year 1774. At that time he had used language which I think it is not quite unfitting to read to you at this time. His colleague had expressed his wish to receive instructions from the electors as to his course of conduct, and his intention of conforming to them. Mr Burke told them that he could do no such thing: "Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him, their opinion high respect, their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfaction to theirs, and above all, ever and in all cases, to prefer their interests to his own. But his unbiassed opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure; no, nor from the law and constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you not his industry only, but his judgment, and he betrays instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion. My worthy colleague says his will ought to be subservient to yours. If that be all, the thing is innocent. If government were a matter of will upon any side, yours, without question, ought to be superior. But government and legislation are matters of reason and judgment, and not of inclination. And what sort of reason is that in which the determination precedes the discussion, in which one set of men deliberate and another decide, and where those who form the conclusion are perhaps three hundred miles distant from those who hear the arguments?

"To deliver an opinion is the right of all men; that of constituents is a weighty and respectable opinion, which a representative ought always to rejoice to hear, and which he ought always most seriously to consider. But *authoritative* instructions; *mandates* issued, which the member is bound blindly and implicitly to obey, to vote and to argue for, though contrary to the clearest conviction of his judgment and conscience; these are things utterly unknown to the laws of the land, and which arise from a fundamental mistake of the whole order and tenor of our constitution.

"Parliament is not a *congress* of ambassadors from different and hostile interests; which interests each must maintain, as an agent and advocate, against other agents and advocates; but Parliament is a *deliberative* assembly of *one* nation, with *one* interest, that of the whole; where no local purposes and local prejudices ought to guide, but the general good, resulting from the general reason of the whole. You can choose a member indeed; but when you have chosen him, he is not a member of Bristol, but a member of *Parliament*. If the local constituent should have an interest or should form a hasty opinion, evidently opposite to the real good of the rest of the community, the member for that place ought to be as far as any other from any endeavour to give it effect."

Well! he had given them this notice of the principle upon which he intended to act; but as might have been expected, when he did act upon it they were offended. He had injured their trade, the merchants of Bristol thought, by his votes on the American War, and by supporting an Act for relieving debtors from the cruel imprisonment to which they were then subjected, and by some important measures connected with Ireland. He had offended their prejudices in other ways, and he had been too busy in his parliamentary work to pay them as many visits as they had supposed were due from a representative. Upon some of these points he had already explained himself in the course of the session of Parliament in a letter addressed to a gentleman in Bristol, and to the Sheriff of Bristol—letters which you will find in his works, and which are full of instruction. But he made his completest defence in a speech delivered just before the election.* That speech, I do think, was the bravest and the wisest ever addressed to an assembly of Englishmen. Would that our younger statesmen would read it again and again, till they have, in the true sense of the phrase, learnt it by heart! I must not indulge in extracts, for I should not know where to begin or where to end. I will read only these sentences: "I became unpopular in England for one of these acts, in Ireland for the other. What, then! What obligation lay on me to be popular? I was bound to serve both kingdoms; to be pleased with that service was their affair, not mine."

The citizens of Bristol were not pleased with this service; they dismissed him. He was returned, however, for another place to that Parliament. The measures of his friends prevailed in it. Lord North abandoned the administration, the Marquis of Rockingham was again Prime Minister. Mr Burke became Paymaster-General of the Forces. In that office he would have accomplished the scheme of economical reform which he had proclaimed in a speech he had delivered two years before. But Lord Rockingham died, and Lord Shelburne succeeded him. Mr Burke believed that the old scheme of ruling by Court influence was about to be resumed by the connivance of this minister. To counteract it he urged on, if he did not propose, a coalition between Mr Fox and Lord North. This was one of the occasions to which I alluded

* For this election speech, see p. 222.

on which Burke disturbed those party relations which he deemed so important, and bore witness that they can at best be only means to an end. Whether he took the right way of accomplishing the end is another question; I said at the beginning of my lecture that I was far from thinking that he passed unhurt through the conflicts of factions. I hoped that we might learn from his biography what are the great and what are the little transactions in which public men are engaged; what are their own greatnesses and littlenesses. If we compare the events in which the Old and the New World are equally interested with these squabbles about Lord Shelburne, and Mr Fox, and Lord North, how beggarly these last appear! If we compare Burke himself returning from Bristol in 1780, with Burke the organiser of a new party in 1783, how great he looks in the hour of defeat, how poor in the hour of success! It is no little satisfaction to remember that that hour of success did not last long. The Fox and North ministry was broken up. Mr Pitt became Premier, and Burke continued out of office for the rest of his life.

One great occupation of these later years he entered upon while he was connected with the ministry. He had given his mind to the relation of England with her colonies in the West. When she was separated from them, he devoted himself as vigorously to her relations with that mighty empire in the East which had been won by her soldiers and was ruled by her merchants. This subject has become to us one of such deep and awful interest, that I have scarcely courage to speak of it merely as illustrating the life of an individual man. And one may rejoice that among the solemn and terrible associations which the name of India awakens in every one of us at this moment, we may quite forget all the bitter animosities and court intrigues which gathered about the bills of Mr Fox and Mr Pitt; all that was merely personal in the prosecution of Warren Hastings. We may rejoice still more, though not without trembling, to believe that some of the allegations which we read in Burke's speeches about the British rule in India—allegations, it is to be feared, derived from only too accurate knowledge—some of his comparisons of the older government which had supplanted it, would have been retracted if he had had the experience of another seventy or eighty years. But the substantial part of these speeches remains, after all these deductions, a study and warning for the English statesman and the Englishman, which now less than ever he can afford to forget. It was the greatest honour and glory of Burke's life, that which raised his politics so far above the level of ordinary politics, that he was awake himself, that he did strive to awaken his countrymen, to a sense of the tremendous responsibility under which the possession of such an empire laid us; to a sense of the misery which we should bring upon ourselves and our institutions if we ever regarded races and nations as articles of merchandise. If there had not been some who took this measure of our duties when they first devolved upon us, could India have received any of the blessings which we boast of having conferred upon her? If we had been generally aroused to the sense of our obligations, should we have needed a plague of fire and of blood to tell us that no one of us can any longer deny his share of the guilt or of the penalty?

I have left myself no time for speaking of the last eleven years of Burke's life, and of that series of his work which opens with his "Reflections upon the French Revolution." It is better that I should have done so, for there is comparatively little difference of opinion in this day about his conduct in the American War. There is a general disposition to acknowledge that he did good service ultimately, if not immediately, to India. But a thousand questions arise respecting his views of the events in France, which are mixed with all the controversies and heats of our own age. The little which I say upon this subject will be for the purpose of illustrating the character of the man, and for the further purpose, which I have kept before me throughout this lecture, of showing how we may profit by his wisdom, even if we have fallen upon times which require a higher guidance than that which he can give us, and if we have had some experience which may enable us to correct the conclusions which he deduced from his. It is notorious that his opinions respecting the French Revolution separated him from some of the friends to whom he had been most attached, especially from the one upon whom he had bestowed so splendid a panegyric in his speech on the Indian Bill. "Thus ended" (this is his own pathetic narrative of the separation, in the "Annual Register")—"thus ended a friendship which had lasted a quarter of a century. The House proceeded to the order of the day, and shortly afterwards adjourned." Though he wished to restore what he called the old Whig party, he did in fact prove the great render and confounder of parties. Nevertheless I think that any one who observes that characteristic of his speeches respecting America which I have dwelt upon—I mean his assertion that there are actual relations existing between nations and between all the orders in a particular nation, and that the whole happiness of society depends upon the acknowledgment of these relations and upon the fulfilment of the mutual duties which they involve—will not wonder or think him inconsistent if he complained of a revolution which seemed to him to set aside all relations, to reduce society into its original elements, and to rebuild it upon the assertion of individual rights, not of obligations. It seems to me that in protesting against the voluntary

adoption of such a system, he was doing a great service to every country, most of all to the toiling and suffering people of every country. He was asserting a principle which they can the least afford to part with; since every wrong that has been done to them has arisen from the forgetfulness of it. He was right, I think, to say that our English constitution is precious, because it asserts the obligations and responsibilities of the different portions of society to each other, and that it never can be expanded or improved by setting up any maxim which makes one class or another suppose that it has a power which can break through them. Where he seems to me to have failed, is in not sufficiently recognising the width and the depth of these assertions. If it is true that society is constituted of these mutual relations and obligations, then we must look upon every dissolution of society as a divine sentence and judgment upon the indifference or contempt of them. The agents may have worked blindly, often madly. Their blindness and their madness were themselves parts of the sin for which the Judge of all was calling those who had the means of opening their eyes and making them sane, to give account. The sufferings which they produced may well make us tender and charitable to the sufferers. But they must not tempt us, as I think they did very naturally tempt Burke, to overlook the enormous corruptions and the frightful heartlessness which could have no other catastrophe than this, and which, if they had been allowed to fester undisturbed, would have been immeasurably more fatal than any such catastrophe. Nor can I help feeling very strongly that Burke, because he did not judge the sins of the passing age with sufficient severity, looked upon the coming age with far too little hope. He took, it seems to me, a truer measure of the greatness of the events in which he was moving than any of the men about him of either school. He saw that the results of these events could not be calculated by the horoscopes of ordinary politicians. He felt that it was an utter mistake to apply phrases that were borrowed from old classical times or from English history to the French movement. He saw that that was not what is called a constitutional movement in any sense of that word; that it was not an attempt to recover any of the old traditions or principles of French society; that it was a violent defiance of them all. He did not see that it might be an effort to assert that there is an order for human beings, a fellowship for men simply as men, which constitutional maxims are by their very nature too limited, too national, to uphold. He did not see that there was no necessary contradiction between such a human, such a universal fellowship, and those national institutions of which no one understood the worth so well as himself. He did not see that through tremendous conflicts, through efforts at a universal anarchy or at a universal despotism, God might design to show us at last what the true human society is, and how all particular societies may attain their own highest growth and fruitfulness in the light of it. Because with all his gift of prophesying evils which were certainly to come, he could not perceive this good which might be lying behind them, he was not always able, I think, to understand even that past history which he had explored so diligently. With all his honesty and nobleness he could not quite think that the preservation of the order of the world was not in some degree owing to the tricks and contrivances of statesmen, even though he had continual and painful experience how much they were contributing to increase its disorders. He could not do justice to the piety of the men of our revolution whom he admired most, a piety which rose above their own narrow conceptions as well as the poor theories of their opponents. He could not think that they entirely meant what they said, that God put down those who had broken their obligations to Him. He thought it was a seemly and beautiful phrase, not the utterance of an everlasting truth. I believe that these times, at the coming of which he trembled with a natural and reasonable fear —with the fear of a man who understood that they were to be most awful, who did not understand that the more awful they were the more they bore witness of the guidance of Him in whom all awe dwells—were to teach us that no seemly phrases which mean nothing can stand the shock of a mighty crisis; but that such a crisis may bring to light that which lay hidden and half-dead beneath them, may bring us face to face with realities to which they pointed. I believe that all history has become more grave, and terrible, and full of significance, since that time, because the present has become more grave and terrible also; but that if we have faith to look upon both, to see in each the interpretation of the other, we shall not shrink from the thought of the future, because it must compel us to meet the whole problem of human society, because it must compel us to seek for a divine solution of that problem.

Burke died in the year 1797; he belongs emphatically to the last age. He left no successor, as he once dreamt that he might, who should maintain his principles and support his name in the coming age. He died childless. It was the loss of his son, on whom he had looked with an affection which belonged to his character, with an exaggerated admiration which was a most pardonable exercise of his fancy, which struck the final blow to his spirit as well as to his body. There is no decline of intellectual power in his later works. His eloquence perhaps reaches its highest point in them; but there is the irritation and despondency which I have endeavoured to account for. There is the

lesson to us, that each man has his appointed work to do, that more than that work he cannot do; that if he does it as ever in his great Task-master's eye, the times to come may bless his memory and give thanks for his wisdom; but that we are not to expect from men past, present, or coming, that which we may look for and shall find in Him who is, and was, and is to come.

LORD BEACONSFIELD.

1805–1881.

THE IRISH CHURCH.*

[MR DISRAELI'S first appearance in the House is thus cleverly sketched in "Random Recollections in the House of Commons," published in 1838: "Mr Disraeli, the member for Maidstone, is perhaps the best known among the new members who have made their *début*. . . . His own private friends looked forward to his introduction into the House of Commons as a circumstance which would be immediately followed by his obtaining for himself an oratorical reputation equal to that enjoyed by the most popular speakers in that assembly. . . . When he rose, which he did immediately after Mr O'Connell had concluded his speech, all eyes were fixed on him, and all ears were open to listen to his eloquence; but, before he had proceeded far, he furnished a striking illustration of the hazard that attends on highly-wrought expectations. After the first few minutes he met with every possible manifestation of opposition and ridicule from the ministerial benches, and was, on the other hand, cheered in the loudest and most earnest manner by his Tory friends; and it is particularly deserving of mention that even Sir Robert Peel, who very rarely cheers any honourable gentleman, not even the most able and accomplished speakers of his own party, greeted Mr Disraeli's speech with a prodigality of applause which must have been severely trying to the worthy baronet's lungs. . . .

"At one time, in consequence of the extraordinary interruptions he met with, Mr Disraeli intimated his willingness to resume his seat, if the House wished him to do so. He proceeded, however, for a short time longer, but was still assailed by groans and undergrowls in all their varieties; the uproar, indeed, often became so great as completely to drown his voice.

"At last, losing all temper, which, until now, he had preserved in a wonderful manner, he paused in the midst of a sentence, and looking the Liberals indignantly in the face, raised his hands, and opening his mouth as wide as its dimensions would permit, said, in remarkably loud and almost terrific tones, 'I will sit down now, but *the time will come when you will hear me.*' Mr Disraeli then sat down amidst the loudest uproar, which lasted for some time.

"Mr Disraeli's appearance and manner were very singular. His dress also was peculiar; it had much of a theatrical aspect. His black hair was long and flowing, and he had a most ample crop of it. His gesture was abundant; he often appeared as if trying with what celerity he could move his body from one side to another, and throw his hands out and draw them in again. At other times he flourished one hand before his face, and then the other. His voice, too, is of a very unusual kind: it is powerful, and had every justice done to it in the way of exercise. . . . His utterance was rapid, and he never seemed at a loss for words."]

Sir, the right hon. gentleman the member for South Lancashire has moved that we should go into committee of the whole House upon the subject of the Irish Church, in order that he may propose resolutions which he has placed upon the table. We have not at present to discuss those resolutions, which would lead us into matters of great detail, of constitutional interest, and of legal difficulty, which might divert us from the general topic which now engages our attention. I apprehend that so far as the right hon. gentleman is concerned, there is no mistake as to his general meaning; for, although he has not yet had an opportunity of moving his resolutions, he has expressed the outline of the policy which he proposes that this House and the country should adopt. I apprehend that I am not in any way misrepresenting his meaning, or misinterpreting his expressions, a thing most foreign from my intention, when I say that the right hon. gentleman proposes to terminate the connection between the State and the Church, so far as Ireland is concerned, which in neological phrase is styled disestablishment; and that he proposes a policy which first partially, and in the end completely, would accomplish the disendowment of the Church in Ireland. I believe I have correctly expressed what the right hon. gentleman has stated, or rather intimated,

* From a speech delivered in the House of Commons, April 3, 1868, in the debate on going into committee on the Irish Church Bill.

and what if opportunity offered he would in more detail bring under our consideration.

Well, sir, this question having been brought before the House and the country somewhat suddenly, as all will admit, the Government had to consider what was the proper mode in which to encounter it. They might have moved the "previous question" to the motion for going into committee. That is a course which upon the same subject was, I believe, adopted by our predecessors three years ago, and it is a course which is much approved by those who have experience of parliamentary life when they deal with difficult questions. It might have been prudent three years ago to meet this motion by moving the previous question; but I think myself, considering the circumstances under which this question is now brought forward, not by an isolated and independent Member of Parliament, but by a party of considerable power, by the leader of the Opposition in this House, and under circumstances, as it appears to us, of precipitation, and, consequently, being a question which attracts and even alarms the public and the House—it would have been unwise of us to have taken refuge in a course at all times ambiguous, and not altogether satisfactory.

Well, sir, a motion to consider the condition of the Irish Church, or, strictly speaking, to go into committee for that purpose, we might have met with a direct negative; but what would have been the inevitable inference which would have been drawn from such a course on our part? It would have been said we were of opinion that no change, no improvement, no modification was necessary, expedient, or desirable in the condition of the Church in Ireland. That was not the conclusion we wished to express. That was not our opinion; and I will meet in due course the demand of the right hon. gentleman who has just sat down on this subject that, so far as we are concerned, there shall be a clear and intelligible issue. But if it were our opinion that the condition of the Church in Ireland was susceptible of beneficial changes, how could we, without exposing ourselves to the grossest misrepresentation of our views, have met the motion with a direct negative? Who can doubt what would have been the inference drawn? In their speeches, hon. gentlemen would have asked, "Is the old reign of bigotry never to cease? Are you resolved to oppose all improvements? Are you prepared to deny that there are any anomalies to be corrected in arrangements which were settled—hastily settled—at a period of great political excitement forty years ago—are you doggedly determined to say that there is no possible room for improvement in the condition of the Irish Church?" We know that would have been the general tenor of the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite; and, sir, not only towards those reproaches, but because we are of opinion that considerable modifications may be made in the temporalities of that Church, highly to the advantage of the Church herself, we could not take the course of meeting a motion of this kind with a direct negative. What was the third means open to us? To move an amendment. An amendment has been moved by my noble friend the Foreign Secretary, which has been the object of much criticism, as has been every amendment moved since I have sat in this House, but I am prepared to maintain that this amendment is drawn in strict accordance with parliamentary experience and precedent. We took that course, acting on the example of the most eminent men that ever controlled the affairs of the House of Commons, and we took it, believing that it was the one most advantageous to the public interests.

Now, sir, when Sir Robert Peel was the leader of the Opposition—of that long opposition, the opposition of seven years—during the Seven Years' War—when the circumstances of the House were not very different from those which now prevail, when there was, as there has now been for many years in this House, a balanced state of parties, and when every year there was not one but more than one struggle for power between the great parties, on one occasion when, as on the present occasion, a motion was to be met by an amendment, the invariable advice of Sir Robert Peel was this: "If you are obliged to have an amendment, never attempt to express your policy in an amendment. If you attempt to express it fully, you will produce a long and cumbrous document, which will open an immense number of issues, and which must bring about very protracted discussions. If, on the other hand, you adopt concinnity of expression and condensation, you will be accused of ambiguity and equivocation. The province of a party is to express and vindicate its policy in debate. Your amendment should never be inconsistent with your policy, but you must fix on some practical point, which, if carried, would defeat the motion of your opponent."

Now, sir, I think that very sound advice, and it has been invariably followed, not only by Sir Robert Peel's friends, but by his distinguished opponents. If you look to all the amendments drawn up upon all great occasions by Sir Robert Peel's party and by Lord Russell's party, you will find that the adoption of that advice has been the invariable rule. Well, with this view, in drawing the amendment, her Majesty's ministers fixed on two points—which they thought essentially practical, which, if the House accepted them, would defeat the motion of the right hon. gentleman, and which are perfectly consistent with the policy I am prepared to explain, expound, and uphold. These two points have already been mentioned to the House in the observations which I took the liberty of making when the hon. member for Cork brought forward his motion on the state of Ireland.]

mentioned then that in our opinion, so far as the Church in Ireland was concerned, it was most expedient that we should await the report of the Royal Commission which has been recently appointed, and which has been extremely industrious, as we have reason to believe, in its labours. That report, we believed, would be in our possession, I will not say in an early part of the session, but in the spring of this year.

That was one position I took up. There was another. I denied the moral competence of this House of Commons to enter on a discussion of this question with a view to its settlement. I did not, as the right hon. gentleman the member for London [Mr Goschen] the other night stated—I did not resist the motion on the ground that this was what he called a moribund Parliament. Nothing of the kind. Although this might be the last session of the present Parliament, and although when an election takes place for a future Parliament the appeal may be made to a larger constituency, I do not for a moment bring forward those circumstances as the basis of the argument that this House was not morally competent to deal with the question. I rested it precisely on another reason, I said that when a fundamental law of the country was called into question, though technically and legally this House had a right to do anything within the sphere of the House of Commons, it was not morally competent to decide a question if those who had elected it had not, in the constitutional course of public life, received some intimation that such a question was to come before it. That is what I said. It is very different from the misrepresentation—unintentional, of course—of the member for the city of London.

Well, now I ask, had the country the slightest intimation during the last few years—previous to or during the period of the political existence of this House, has it had the slightest intimation that this important, this all-important question, not only from its specific nature, but also from the ulterior consequences which it may induce, would be brought under discussion in Parliament? I appeal to the programme of the Prime Minister of the time, which recommended a dissolution of Parliament, and explained his policy to the country. There is not the slightest allusion to the state of the Irish Church in that programme. We know very well from the correspondence which has taken place between a prelate of the Irish Church, himself a man of eminent abilities and accomplishments—and the right hon. gentleman—although the letter appeared to take the right hon. gentleman by surprise the other night—we know that the right hon. gentleman, at the time of the dissolution, had not the remotest idea that the Irish Church would become the great subject of discussion. Sir, it is impossible to suppose that the right hon. gentleman is not sincere in anything which he writes at the moment he writes it, and I have not the slightest doubt that that was as honest a letter as even the right hon. gentleman ever wrote. I do not throw the slightest suspicion on that letter. But, after all, what was the character of it? Is it not a record of the fact that only three years ago the right hon. gentleman treated the question of the Church in Ireland as one which was totally without the pale of modern politics—that he thought it could never be revived or restored, and that, if it were, he saw immense difficulties arising from the Articles of Union? But if it were revived or restored, and if these difficulties were mooted, his imagination could not conceive the possibility that in such a subject he should be mixed up. Well, that is evidence of what our leading men—men who guided the opinion not of their party only, but of the country—thought of this great question. If that is not complete evidence of the view taken by Lord Palmerston and one of his chief ministers in this House with regard to the question of the Church in Ireland and its political position, I say that no evidence can satisfy any person. Notwithstanding all this, the question is suddenly brought before us.

Now, sir, I take no exaggerated view of even the Articles of Union. I have not for a moment pretended that the Articles of Union between the two nations are irreversible. I have not for a moment pretended that the Articles of Union, and the great Acts of Parliament which were passed to carry them into effect, cannot, by the consent of the sovereign and of the estates of the realm be changed or modified. And this I will venture to say, that they are, as I think all must acknowledge, among the most solemn muniments of the nation, and I do say that it is preposterous that we should be asked to reverse such solemn muniments at eight days' notice. In the course of this debate I have heard hon. gentlemen, referring to the Articles of Union and these Acts of Parliament, make remarks which seemed to me to strike at the root of all social security and political stability. We have been told that these Articles were negotiated between a Protestant Parliament in Dublin and a Protestant Parliament in London.

Sir, you cannot trifle with the history of our country in that way. What was the Bill of Rights? Are you prepared to give up the Bill of Rights because it was passed by a Parliament of boroughmongers? If you adopt the principle of analysing so finely the constituent elements of the public bodies that have negotiated and agreed to the great documents which are the charters of the people's rights, you may invalidate our prime liberties and level a blow against the security of property and order, which has hitherto been the pride and the boast of this country. Taking these two points, we endeavoured to comprise them in the amendment.

We expressed in the amendment the opinion that until we had the report of the Royal Commission it would be inexpedient for the House to enter into the consideration of the Church in Ireland; and at the same time we expressed our opinion that the decision upon these great points should be reserved for the new Parliament. And then we are told that because we used the word "reserve"—a strictly parliamentary word—we invited the next Parliament to enter into a discussion of this question. Now, you may depend upon it that the next Parliament will not much care for our invitation. If we think we are going to hoodwink or lead the next Parliament, or to deprive it of its fair privileges or prerogatives, we shall commit one of the greatest blunders ever committed by man. Why, sir, in the free and frank expression of parliamentary language, it is perfectly open to me, or to any one else, to contest the moral competence of this House to do a particular act, but surely hon. gentlemen would hardly have such language used in a formal resolution. Therefore, in that amendment, we did not state that the House was not competent to enter into the discussion of this matter, but instead of using such explicit language, we put it in a quieter and softer phrase, and said that the discussion ought to be reserved for a future Parliament.

These are the two points which were intended to be conveyed in this amendment. According to all parliamentary rule and precedent, nothing can, to my mind, be more unjustifiable in argument than the captious criticism which has been directed against this amendment — criticism founded on an assumption which no one had a right to form. Well, sir, the right hon. gentleman, in his opening speech, anticipated some of those criticisms, which it is unnecessary for me to notice. Perhaps I ought to notice the remarks which were made by the noble lord the member for Stamford. The noble lord saw in this amendment, of which I have given the House the plain history—I say the plain and true history—the noble lord saw in the language of the amendment great cause for mistrust and want of confidence. He saw immediately that we were about to betray the trust with which he deems us to be invested. The noble lord is at no time wanting in imputing to us the being influenced by not the most amiable motives which can regulate the conduct of public men. I do not quarrel with the invective of the noble lord. The noble lord is a man of great talent, and he has vigour in his language. There is great vigour in his invective, and no want of vindictiveness. I admit that, now speaking as a critic, and perhaps not as an impartial one, I must say I think it wants finish. Considering that the noble lord has studied the subject, and that he has written anonymous articles against me before and since I was his colleague—I do not know whether he wrote them when I was his colleague—I think it must have been accomplished more *ad unguem*. There is one thing which the noble lord never pardons, and that is the passing of the Reform Act of last year. But I put it to the House what would have been the general state of affairs if the counsels of the noble lord upon that subject had prevailed instead of the suggestions which I made, and which the House adopted? Now that we are free from the heat and the great difficulties and perplexities of the last session, and can take, I hope, a fair view of what occurred, I would express my opinion—and I think it is not peculiar to myself—that we passed last year a most beneficent and noble Act. I have not the slightest apprehension, and I do not speak of my personal connection with the matter—but as the first minister of the Crown—I look with no apprehension whatever to the appeal that will be made to the people under the provisions of the Act. I believe you will have a Parliament returned to this House full of patriotic and national sentiment, whose decision will add spirit to the community and strength to the State.

Sir, the only objection which I have to these attacks of the noble lord is that they invariably produce an echo from the other side. That, it seems to me, is now almost a parliamentary law. When the bark is heard on this side, the right hon. member for Calne emerges, I will not say from his cave, but, perhaps, from a more cynical habitation. He joins immediately in the chorus of reciprocal malignity, and

"Hails with horrid melody the moon."

The right hon. gentleman has been extremely analytical upon the amendment of my noble friend—the amendment, that is, of the Government, moved by my noble friend; and his "zig-zag" commentary, founded on the assumption of circumstances that never occurred, and motives that never influenced us, was amusing at the moment. But how far does that commentary agree with the real statement I have given of the cause and origin of this amendment?

The right hon. gentleman was extremely exuberant in his comments upon my character and career. I will not trouble the House with a defence of that character and career. I have sat in this House more than thirty years, and can truly say that during that time comments upon my character and career have been tolerably free. But the House has been the jury of my life, and it allows me now here to address it; and therefore here is not the place in which I think it necessary to vindicate myself. The hon. gentleman the member for Calne is a very remarkable man. He is a learned man, though he despises history. He can chop logic like Dean Aldrich, but what is more remarkable

than his learning and his logic is that power of spontaneous aversion which particularises him. There is nothing that he likes, and almost everything that he hates. He hates the working-classes of England. He hates the Roman Catholics of Ireland. He hates the Protestants of Ireland. He hates her Majesty's ministers. And until the right hon. gentleman the member for South Lancashire placed his hand upon the ark, he seemed almost to hate the right hon. gentleman the member for South Lancashire. But now all is changed. Now we have the hour and the man. But I believe the clock goes wrong, and the man is mistaken.

Let me now ask the attention of the House to the proposition before us. If I have for a moment trespassed upon their attention they will allow me to say that it has been in fair self-defence. I have never attacked any one in my life [loud cries of "Oh!" and "Peel!"], unless I was first assailed. Now, sir, no one can deny this, that the propositions of the right hon. gentleman are very considerable. They are vast and violent. All admit that. [Cries of "No!"] Well, hon. gentlemen say "No;" but to disestablish an institution that has existed 300 years, that is in the possession of property, that is certainly supported by the sympathies of a great part of the population of the country—to propose to subvert such an institution—without now going into the merits of the case—is surely a vast and violent change.

Well, then, the first question I will ask is, "Why this change?" and upon that point we have had no satisfactory answer. We are told that there is a crisis in Ireland, and the hon. member for Birmingham the other night, with, I must say, one of those characteristics which he invariably displays, but in an agreeable manner, that of misrepresentation, said that I denied that there was anything critical in the state of Ireland, and that Ireland was, so far as my opinions were concerned, in a perfectly satisfactory state. Why, sir, I never said that Ireland was in a satisfactory state. In a great debate like this the House will, I am sure, be indulgent to me if I touch upon some of these topics. I denied that there was an Irish crisis according to the interpretation of the member for South Lancashire. The member for South Lancashire, when the late Parliament was dissolved not four years ago, was of opinion that the Irish Church was a question totally out of the pale of modern politics. He seemed to shrink from the profanation of the idea that he or any human being could ever disturb it. And yet he is the man who comes forward to abolish that institution. Well, I must look to the grounds upon which he founds such a violent proceeding. He said there was a crisis in Ireland, and as I thought at the time with dangerous candour he analysed that crisis and gave its causes and its elements. And what were they? Fenianism was one. Fenianism when he was a minister was rampant and mysterious, and the more dangerous because it was mysterious. Fenianism now is not rampant; we think we have gauged its lowest depths, and we are not afraid of it. That is one of the evidences and elements of this crisis. Does it not seem rather strange that though Fenianism was so critical when he was a minister we heard nothing of the crisis, but when I am minister and Fenianism is so subdued, it is made the principal argument for a revolution?

Well, what was the second element of the right hon. gentleman? He said there was a startling and dangerous emigration from the country. I never liked the emigration from Ireland. I have deplored it. I know that the finest elements of political power are men, and therefore I have not sympathised with the political economists who would substitute entirely for men animals of a lower organisation. I never heard an opinion of that kind from the right hon. gentleman. I have always understood that the right hon. gentleman and his friends looked on "the depletion" of Ireland not without satisfaction. But this I know, that the emigration from Ireland has lasted now for a considerable number of years, during most of which the right hon. gentleman was a leading minister of the Crown, and yet he never said that in consequence of that emigration the state of Ireland was critical. And I know that now when I have the honour to be a minister of the Crown, and view still with anxiety the emigration from that country, though I have the satisfaction of seeing that it is reduced, the right hon. gentleman says this also is an element in the crisis of Ireland. Well, then, how am I to understand that the second element of the crisis is one which can really be advanced as an argument in favour of a great revolution?

Then, sir, another element of the right hon. gentleman was education. The people of Ireland were so educated that you must destroy the Irish Church. Well, the people of Ireland have been educated a great number of years, thank God, and I wish the people of England had been educated as well. I am not aware that the education of the Irish people during the two short years we have sat upon this bench has created the Irish crisis. The education of the Irish people has been very advantageous to them; and I am not aware that I have been one of the members of this House who have done anything to restrict that education. As for the fourth cause of the crisis, I should have thought that, having passed a Reform Bill last year, that was a reason why we should have lost no time in passing a Reform Bill for Ireland. Instead of doing that we are to acknowledge a crisis. I say, under these circumstances, I was certainly justified in utterly repudiating the principle

upon which the whole policy of the right hon. gentleman is founded—namely, that there is a crisis in Ireland; but the hon. member for Birmingham is not justified in saying, from my adoption of that argument, that I assert that the state of Ireland is perfectly satisfactory, that nothing need be done, and that the whole agitation is a delusion.

As I cannot admit that there is a crisis in Ireland according to the views of the right hon. gentleman the member for South Lancashire, I will state my view of the condition of Ireland. I do not think there is an Irish crisis, but if there be one it is not occasioned by any of the causes mentioned by the right hon. gentleman. But I say, and I have said it very often, that the condition of Ireland is, on the whole, not entirely satisfactory. The general proposition the right hon. gentleman has placed before us is the foundation of what I look upon as a great change, and I may say a revolution in our policy; and the circumstances on which he based it ranged over 700 years. The premises from which the right hon. gentleman drew his deductions were 700 years. Well, how can we, when a great statesman comes forward, all of a sudden, like a thief in the night, and recommends a course so vast and violent, that as yet we have got as it were only into the antechamber of the great discussion it will involve —I say when the right hon. gentleman brings forward such vast premises, and draws his conclusions from them, what can we do, in the first instance, at least, but take general views? If a man tells me that my country is in a critical state in consequence of the misgovernment of 700 years, as a sensible and prudent man I must take general views; but I take general views within a very limited range. I compare the state of Ireland and its people, not when they were under the tender mercies of ancient historical characters, but I take a limited practical view. Is the condition of the Irish people now worse than it was before the Union? So far as my researches guide me you find the people of Ireland are in a much better position. They are in the enjoyment of social and political rights they did not then possess; they are better fed, better clothed, and better paid than tney were. So much for the working population. The middle class are more wealthy, and more enterprising; and the landlords, upon whom such attacks are made, have an advantage which English landlords do not always have—they get their rents paid. Is the condition of Ireland worse at this moment, when we are called upon precipitately to take this serious step, than it was during the revolutionary war? Were the people then better clothed and better fed? were their wages higher or as high? You know they were not. Take the time when the tithe-proctors were fighting the people. Was the condition of Ireland then to be at all compared with its condition now? Is it not an absolute fact that all classes of the population in Ireland at this moment are more prosperous, are wealthier, are in the enjoyment of political and social rights which their ancestors and predecessors did not enjoy fifty years ago? Is it not true that the working population are at this moment in the enjoyment of a higher rate of wages, and consequently in a higher state of social enjoyment, than at any previous period of their history?

Well, sir, that has been urged—it has never been answered. The chief secretary of the Lord Lieutenant, in a statement full of the most accurate information and weighty argument, placed that before the House, and not a single gentleman opposite for a moment impugned the accuracy of his facts or the soundness of his conclusions. Well, how are we met? A statesman who in this position of affairs makes the enormous sacrifice of all the convictions of his life, tells us that the state of Ireland is so critical that he must do that which only three years ago, when mentioned, struck him with such inexpressible horror, he said the question was without the pale of political debate. I want to know on what ground he does this. The candid ingenuity of several gentlemen opposite gives us the ground—the evils of Ireland. We have proved that the country is richer, the people are more prosperous, the landlords have their rents, the middle class are perpetually engaging in speculation and shares, and the working population have doubled their wages. Since that has been proved and acknowledged even by hon. gentlemen opposite, because it could no longer be denied, the whole thing, this wide-spread discontent, this constant disaffection, and the perilous position of the Church in Ireland, is explained by the fact, the recent discovery, that though the evils of Ireland are not materially increased, there are moral evils, there are sentimental evils to be redressed. We are called upon now to argue the question—not as in recent times when we had to discuss the political and material condition of Ireland—but we are asked to take a vast and violent step because the people of Ireland are suffering under a moral, or, as it has been styled, a sentimental grievance.

Well, sir, I am not the man to despise a sentimental grievance. I think he takes a very contracted view of life and of human nature who despises the sentimental grievances of a nation; but when we have to deal with sentimental grievances, and when in consequence of sentimental grievances we are asked to make very material changes, I think every candid mind will agree that we ought to proceed with caution. Though we may be ready to make very great sacrifices to soothe the pride and gratify the feeling of race, still to take some

precipitate step and fail in accomplishing our desire would be disastrous to the State and humiliating to the statesman. Now, what are those sentimental grievances of the Irish people? I am not conscious that I have ever been deficient in sympathy for the Irish people. They have engaging qualities, which I think every man who has any heart must respect. But I must say nothing surprises me more than the general conduct of the Irish people on this subject of sentimental grievances. They are a race who are certainly among the bravest of the brave, most ingenious, witty, very imaginative, and therefore very sanguine; but for them to go about the world announcing that they are a conquered race, does appear to me the most extraordinary thing in the world. All of us, nations and individuals, are said to have a skeleton in the house. I do not say that I have not one. I hope I have not—if I had I would turn the key upon him. But for the Irish ostentatiously to declare that they are a conquered race is very strange. If they really were a conquered race, they are not the people who ought to announce it. It is the conquerors from whom we should learn the fact, for it is not the conquered who should go about the world and announce their shame and humiliation.

But I entirely deny that the Irish are a conquered race. I deny that they are more of a conquered race than the people of any other nation. Therefore, I cannot see that there is any real ground for the doleful tone in which they complain that they are the most disgraced of men, and make that the foundation for the most unreasonable requests. Ireland is not one whit more conquered than England. They are always telling us that the Normans conquered Ireland. Well, I have heard that the Normans conquered England too, and the only difference between the two conquests is that while the conquest of Ireland was only partial, that of England was complete. Then they tell us that was a long time ago, but since then there was a dreadful conquest by Cromwell, when Cromwell not only conquered the people, but confiscated their estates. But Cromwell conquered England. He conquered the House of Commons. He ordered that bauble to be taken away, in consequence of which an hon. member, I believe of very advanced Liberal opinions, the other night proposed that we should raise a statue to his memory. But Cromwell not only conquered us, but he forfeited and sequestrated estates in every county in England. Well, sir, then we are told that the Dutch conquered Ireland, but, unfortunately, they conquered England too. They marched from Devonshire to London through the midst of a grumbling population. But the Irish fought like gentlemen for their sovereign, and there is no disgrace in the battle of the Boyne, nor does any shame attach to the sword of Sarsfield. I wish I could say as much for the conduct of the English leaders at that time. Therefore, the habit of the Irish coming forward on all occasions to say that they are a conquered race, and, in consequence of their being a conquered race, they must destroy the English institutions, is a most monstrous thing.

Then we are told that the Church in Ireland is a badge of this conquest. Well, sir, I will not go into the question as to the origin of the Irish Church. I hope that nothing shall induce me to enter into a controversy as to whether St Patrick was a Protestant or not. But I ask this plain question from this conquered race—who attain an eminent position in every country where wars are successful—why is the Church of Ireland more a badge of conquest to the Roman Catholics of that country than the Church of England is to the Dissenters? There is this difference, that according to their own story countless generations almost have elapsed since the Roman Catholics were in possession of these churches in Ireland, while in England there was a great change within comparatively modern times, the fact being that one meets almost every day in England the descendants of some one or other of the ejected ministers, but we never meet a burly nonconformist who tells us that he is a member of a conquered race, and that he regards the Church of England as a badge of conquest. The Dissenter disapproves of the Church, and he hopes some day to terminate its existence as an establishment, but he considers himself to be on perfectly equal terms. As far as their relation to the Church Establishment is concerned, what difference is there between the Roman Catholics of Ireland and the nonconformists of this country, who are among the most wealthy, influential, and intelligent of her Majesty's subjects, scores of whom, moreover, occupy seats in this House at the present moment? If there is any difference, the feelings of the English Dissenter ought to be more bitter than those of the Roman Catholic. That is, therefore, another point, so far as sentimental grievances are concerned, of which I really do hope we shall hear no more.

THE PURSUIT OF KNOWLEDGE.*

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—When I last had the honour of addressing the members of the Manchester Athenæum they were struggling for the existence of their institution. That was a critical moment in their fortunes. They had incurred a considerable debt in its establishment; the number of its members had gradually, and even for some years considerably, decreased; and, in appealing to the sympathies of the community, they were, unfortunately, appealing to

* An address delivered to the members of the Manchester Athenæum, October 3, 1844.

those who were themselves only emerging from a period of severe and lengthened suffering. A year has elapsed, and the efforts that you then made to extricate yourselves from those difficulties may now be fairly examined. That considerable debt has been liquidated; the number of your members has been trebled—I believe quadrupled; and I am happy to say that your fortunes have rallied, while that suffering and surrounding community once more meet together in prosperity and success.

I think it not inopportune, at this moment of security and serene fortune, that we should clearly understand the object for which this great struggle has been made. Under circumstances which, if not desperate, filled you with the darkest gloom, you resolved like men to exert your utmost energies; you applied yourselves to those difficulties with manly energy—with manly discretion. Not too confident in yourselves, you appealed, and appealed successfully, to the softer sex, who you thought would sympathise with an institution intended to humanise and refine. *Dux fœmina facti* might indeed be the motto of your institution, for it was mainly by their influence you obtained the result which we now celebrate. But if the object you had at stake was of so great consequence, if it justified exertions so remarkable, made, too, at a moment when energy was doubly valuable, because all were dispirited, it would, I think, be not unwise for us clearly to understand what was the object for which we then exerted ourselves, whether it was one which justified the great sacrifice, and, if it were, to inquire why it was ever imperilled. To-night we are honoured by many, who, like myself, are strangers, except in feeling, to your community. We are honoured, too, by the presence of deputations from many societies in this county and the North of England, who acknowledge a sympathy and an analogy of pursuit with the Athenæum of Manchester. It will be well, then, to place before them briefly for their instruction, and perhaps it may not be without profit to remind you what that institution is that you have struggled to uphold, but the existence of which was once in danger.

I think it is seven or eight years ago that some of the leading members of your community, remembering, perhaps, that there was a time when they regretted that for them such advantages did not exist, thought they would establish in this great city some institution that might offer to the youth of Manchester relaxation which might elevate, and a distraction which would save them from a senseless dissipation. They thought the time had arrived when a duty devolved on those who took a leading part in the community that they should sympathise with the wants of the rising race, and therefore they resolved to establish an institution where the advantages I have referred to might be supplied. With these views they resolved, in the first instance, that some place should be supplied where the youth of Manchester might become perfectly acquainted with the passing mind and passions, and feelings, and intelligence of the age. That idea was the foundation of your news-room. They rightly understood that the newspaper was the most effective arm of the press. It may in fact be considered as the infantry of the press. It is not indeed a complete battalion—you require ordnance and artillery, and a brilliant cavalry; above all, you require the staff and commander-in-chief, that, without absolutely or actively interfering in the fray, surveys all that occurs, and is ready at all times to apply itself to the quarter which requires counsel; but still you may consider the journal as the most efficient arm of the press. With these views they furnished a chamber in which the members of the Athenæum might become acquainted, by the perusal of the chief journals of the empire, with all that was passing in the country, all that was agitating and interesting the public mind—which might supply them with that information, and guide them in forming those opinions, which it is the duty of every citizen of a free community to be acquainted with and to entertain. But, conscious that, however qualified the journal is to stimulate curiosity, to assist investigation, to guide opinion, the knowledge of that individual that is limited by the daily press is in danger of becoming superficial, you thought that the members of this institution should have some means of consulting the more matured opinions, the more accurate researches of the literary mind of this and other countries, and wisely you made the chamber in which they might read the newspaper an ante-room only to the library. You formed a collection which is now not contemptible in numbers, for you may count it by thousands; which, however, is not so great as many of you must desire; and which, in passing, I may be permitted to say with great humility, is deficient in one respect, which is no disgrace to it, because it is a deficiency which is shared by every great collection in this country, and I believe in Europe, but which I should be glad, and you would be proud, to see supplied in Manchester—I mean in that department which may be described as a commercial library. Manchester, which was once merely an assemblage of manufactures, is now a great mercantile emporium, and at slight expense and with no great difficulty, if there were sufficient zeal, you might make a collection of all those interesting and isolated tracts on commerce which at various times during the last century appeared in England, which now with difficulty you can refer to, but which would form in a collection a peculiar and interesting body of commercial literature, and which, by-the-by, you cannot find in the national repository of this country.

You who had thus furnished the members of this institution with the journal which gave them the information and feelings of the hour, the library where they might correct the hasty opinions which perhaps that passing criticism is apt to engender—you knew there were many not deficient in ability, not deficient in aptness or feeling, to whom the very ceremony of reading is irksome, and who require to be appealed to by another means perhaps at first sight more captivating. Therefore you formed a theatre where lectures were given, where the experiments of philosophy, the investigations of literature, and the prolusions of art, were rendered agreeable to the audience by the charms of the human voice. You were not content with having raised an institution where the journal, the library, and the lecture-room were always prepared to enlighten or amuse—you remembered those wise words of Charles V., who said that "the man who knew two languages had two souls and two lives," and therefore you established classes by which the youth of this city might initiate themselves in a knowledge of the modern languages. Your plan was comprehensive, but it was not limited even by this fourth division. You knew well that in a free country, in a country that prides itself upon the science and practice of self-government, it is the duty—at least, it is the interest—of all men to be able to express themselves in public with perspicuity, and, if possible, with elegance; therefore you established a discussion society, an institution in harmony with the political life and social manners of England. Having thus amply pro vided for the formation of the mind of your new and rising community, you still remembered (borrowing a happy idea from those races of antiquity to whom you owe your name) that any education that confined itself to sedentary pursuits was essentially imperfect, that the body as well as the mind should be cultivated—you wisely, and in no common and ordinary spirit, established a gymnasium. These are the principal characteristics of your institution. There are others on which it would be wearisome to dwell; but I have placed before you six principal objects that you had desired to attain. Having taken this large and comprehensive view of the wants of your society, and meeting them with a spirit so liberal and large, you took the best and wisest step. You knew well the effect that architecture produces on the human mind: you determined, therefore, that your establishment should be embodied in an edifice that should please the imagination and satisfy the taste. You invited the most eminent of modern architects. Under the roof of a noble elevation you supplied the means for pursuing those studies that I have indicated; and this is a simple account of the Manchester Athenæum.

It is difficult to conceive how a nobler purpose, if for a moment we dilate upon it, could have animated your intentions. When we remember the class of your community for which this institution was particularly adapted—when we conceive, difficult as it is, surrounded as we now are with luxury and pleasure—when we attempt to picture to our imaginations what is the position of a youth, perhaps of very tender years, sent, as I am informed is very frequently the case, from a remote district, to form his fortunes in this great metropolis of labour and of science—when we think of that youth, tender in age, with no domestic hearth to soothe and stimulate, to counsel or control—when we picture him to ourselves after a day of indefatigable toil, left to his lonely evenings and his meagre lodgings, without a friend and without a counsellor, flying to dissipation from sheer want of distraction, and perhaps involved in vice before he is conscious of the fatal net that is surrounding him—what a contrast to his position does it offer when we picture him to ourselves with a feeling of self-confidence, which supports and sustains him after his day of toil, entering a great establishment where everything that can satisfy curiosity, that can form taste, that can elevate the soul of man, and lead to noble thoughts and honourable intentions, surrounds him! When we think of the convenience and the comfort, the kindness and the sympathy which, with a due decorum of manners, he is sure to command—this youth, who but a few hours before was a stranger—viewing an institution like the present only in this limited aspect, one must regard it as a great harbour of intellectual refuge and social propriety.

If my description of what this institution offers to us, if my view of what it in some degree supplies, be just, what, I must inquire, is the reason that an institution, the prosperity of which now cannot be doubted, but so brief a time ago could have been apparently in the last stage of its fortunes? It is not an agreeable task—I fear it may be considered by some an invidious one—if I, who am a stranger among you, should attempt to play the critic upon your conduct; but I feel confidence in your indulgence. I remember the kindness which has placed me in this honourable position, and therefore I shall venture to express to you the two reasons to which I think the dangerous state of our position must fairly be ascribed. I would say, in the first place, without imputing the slightest fault to the originators of this institution, wishing to be most distinctly understood as not only not imputing any fault to them, but most decidedly being of opinion that the fault does not lie at their door; still I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that, in the origin of this institution, by circumstances not foreseen, and which certainly were not intended, a party, a limited, and a sectarian feeling, in some degree pervaded its management. I confess, myself, that it appears to me that it would have been a

marvel had it been otherwise. When we remember the great changes that had then but very recently occurred in this country—when we recall to our mind not only the great changes that had occurred, but the still greater ones that were menaced and discussed—when we remember what an influence is created when local jealousy blends with political passion—it is not difficult to imagine, because there are none of us present but in their sphere must have felt its influence—it is not wonderful that men of different political opinions should look with extreme jealousy upon each other. A combination of peculiar circumstances that created a balanced state of parties in those places where the struggle for dominion and power takes place, very much assisted this feeling; and that such a feeling existed throughout all England in a degree more intense and more virulent than has ever been equalled in the history of this country, I think no man will deny, and all must deplore. For my own part, I really believe that, had that party and sectarian feeling proceeded in the same ratio of virulence as it has done for the last twelve or fourteen years, it must have exercised a barbarising influence upon public sentiments and public manners. There are some amongst us now, I know, who believe that the period has arrived when a great effort must be made to emancipate this country from the degrading thraldom of faction—to terminate, if possible, that extreme, that sectarian, and limited view, in which all human conduct is examined, observed, and criticised—to put an end to that exclusiveness, which, in its peculiar sphere, is just as deleterious as that aristocratical exclusiveness of manners which has produced so much evil; and, as far as I can form an opinion, these views have met with sympathy from every part of the country. I look upon it that to-night—I hope I am not mistaken—we are met to consummate and to celebrate the emancipation of this city, at least as far as the Athenæum extends, from the influence of these feelings. I hope that our minds and our hearts are alike open to the true character of this institution, to the necessities which have created it, to the benefits to which it leads; and happy I shall be, and all, I am sure, who are assisting me this evening, if it prove that our efforts, however humble, may have assisted in so delightful and so desirable a consummation.

Now, that is one of the reasons why I believe a blight seemed to have fallen over our fortunes. I think at the same time that there is another cause that has, until recently, exercised an injurious effect upon the position of this institution. I think that a too limited view of its real character has been taken even by those who were inclined to view it in a spirit of extreme friendliness. It has been looked upon in the light of a luxury, and not of a necessity—as a means of enjoyment in the hour of prosperity from which we ought to be debarred when the adverse moment has arrived; so that when trade was prospering, when all was sunshine, a man might condescend to occupy his spare hours in something else than in a melancholy brooding over the state of the country—that, when returns were rapid and profits ready, one might deign to cultivate one's faculties, and become acquainted with what the mind of Europe was conceiving or executing; but these were delights to be reserved only for those chosen hours. Now that, I am bound frankly to say, is not the view which I take of this question—not the idea which I have formed of the real character of the Manchester Athenæum. I look upon it as part of that great educational movement which is the noble and ennobling characteristic of the age in which we live. Viewing it in that light, I cannot consent myself that it shall be supported by fits and starts. The impulse which has given us that movement in modern times is one that may be traced to an age that may now be considered remote, though the swell of the waters has but recently approached our own shores. Heretofore society was established necessarily on a very different principle to that which is now its basis. As civilisation has gradually progressed, it has equalised the physical qualities of man. Instead of the strong arm, it is the strong head that is now the moving principle of society. You have disenthroned Force, and placed on her high seat Intelligence; and the necessary consequence of this great revolution is, that it has become the duty and the delight equally of every citizen to cultivate his faculties. The prince of all philosophy has told you, in an immortal apophthegm so familiar to you all that it is written now in your halls and chambers, "Knowledge is power." If that memorable passage had been pursued by the student who first announced this discovery of that great man to society, he would have found an oracle not less striking, and in my mind certainly not less true; for Lord Bacon has not only said that "knowledge is power," but living one century after the discovery of the printing-press, he has also announced to the world that "knowledge is pleasure." Why, when the great body of mankind had become familiar with this great discovery—when they learned that a new source was opened to them of influence and enjoyment, is it wonderful that from that hour the heart of nations has palpitated with the desire of becoming acquainted with all that has happened, and with speculating on what may occur? It has indeed produced upon the popular intellect an influence almost as great as—I might say analogous to—the great change which was produced upon the old commercial world by the discovery of the Americas. A new standard of value was introduced, and, after this, to be distinguished, man must be intellectual. Nor, indeed, am I sur-

prised that this feeling has so powerfully influenced our race; for the idea that human happiness is dependent on the cultivation of the mind, and on the discovery of truth, is, next to the conviction of our immortality, the idea the most full of consolation to man; for the cultivation of the mind has no limits, and truth is the only thing that is eternal. Indeed, when you consider what a man is who knows only what is passing under his own eyes, and what the condition of the same man must be who belongs to an institution like the one which has assembled us together to-night, is it—ought it to be—a matter of surprise that from that moment to the present you have had a general feeling throughout the civilised world in favour of the diffusion of knowledge? A man who knows nothing but the history of the passing hour, who knows nothing of the history of the past, but that a certain person whose brain was as vacant as his own occupied the same house as himself, who, in a moment of despondency or of gloom, has no hope in the morrow, because he has read nothing that has taught him that the morrow has any changes—that man, compared with him who has read the most ordinary abridgment of history, or the most common philosophical speculation, is as distinct and different an animal as if he had fallen from some other planet, was influenced by a different organisation, working for a different end, and hoping for a different result. It is knowledge that equalises the social condition of man—that gives to all, however different their political position, passions which are in common, and enjoyments which are universal. Knowledge is like the mystic ladder in the patriarch's dream. Its base rests on the primeval earth—its crest is lost in the shadowy splendour of the empyrean; while the great authors who for traditionary ages have held the chain of science and philosophy, of poesy and erudition, are the angels ascending and descending the sacred scale, and maintaining, as it were, the communication between man and heaven. This feeling is so universal that there is no combination of society in any age in which it has not developed itself. It may, indeed, be partly restrained under despotic governments, under peculiar systems of retarded civilisation; but it is a consequence as incidental to the spirit and the genius of the Christian civilisation of Europe, as that the day should follow night, and the stars should shine according to their laws and order. Why, the very name of the institution that brings us together illustrates the fact—I can recall, and I think I see more than one gentleman around me who equally can recall the hours in which we wandered amid

"Fields that cool Ilyssus laves."

I am sure, at least, that my hon. friend the member for Stockport [Mr Cobden] has a lively recollection of that immortal stream, for I remember one of the most effective allusions he made to it in one of the most admirable speeches I ever listened to. But, notwithstanding that allusion, I would still appeal to the poetry of his constitution, and I know it abounds in that quality. I am sure that he could not have looked without emotion on that immortal scene. I still can remember that olive-crowned plain, that sunset crag, that citadel fane of ineffable beauty! That was a brilliant civilisation developed by a gifted race more than 2000 years ago; at a time when the ancestors of the manufacturers of Manchester, who now clothe the world, were themselves covered with skins, and tattooed like the red men of the wilderness. But influences more powerful even than the awful lapse of time separate and distinguish you from that race. They were the children of the sun; you live in a distant, a rugged, and northern clime. They bowed before different altars, they followed different customs, they were modified by different manners. Votaries of the beautiful, they sought in art the means of embodying their passionate conceptions; you have devoted your energies to utility; and by the means of a power almost unknown to antiquity, by its miraculous agencies, you have applied its creative force to every combination of human circumstances that could produce your objects. Yet, amid the toil and triumphs of your scientific industry, upon you there comes the undefinable, the irresistible yearning for intellectual refinement—you build an edifice consecrated to those beautiful emotions and to those civilising studies in which they excelled, and you impress upon its front a name taken from—

"Where on Ægean shores a city rose,
Built nobly, clear the air, and light the soil,
Athens, the eye of Greece, mother of arts
And eloquence!"

What a beautiful tribute to immortal genius! What a sublime incentive to eternal fame! Then, when the feeling is so universal, when it is one which modern civilisation is nurturing and developing, who does not feel that it is not only the most benevolent, but the most politic thing you can do to avail yourselves of its influence, and to direct in every way the formation of that character upon which intellect must now necessarily exercise an irresistible influence? We cannot shut our eyes any longer to the immense revolution which has taken place. Knowledge is no longer a lonely eremite that offers an occasional and captivating hospitality to some wandering pilgrim; knowledge is now found in the market-place, a citizen and a leader of citizens. The spirit has touched the multitude; it has impregnated the mass:

"—— Totamque infusa per artus,
Mens agitat molem, et magno se corpore miscet."

("This active mind, infused through all the space,
Unites and mingles with the mighty mass.")
—VIRG. *Æn.*, vi. 726, 727, *Dryden's Translation.*

I would say one word now to those for whom this institution is not entirely but principally formed. I would address myself to the youth on whom the hopes of all societies repose and depend. I doubt not that they feel conscious of the position which they occupy—a position which, under all circumstances, at all periods, and in every clime and country, is one replete with duty. The youth of a nation are the trustees of posterity; but the youth I address have duties peculiar to the position which they occupy. They are the rising generation of a society unprecedented in the history of the world; that is at once powerful and new. In other parts of the kingdom the remains of an ancient civilisation are prepared to guide, to cultivate, to influence the rising mind; but they are born in a miraculous creation of novel powers, and it is rather a providential instinct that has developed the necessary means of maintaining the order of your new civilisation, than the matured foresight of man. This is their inheritance. They will be called on to perform duties—great duties. I, for one, wish for their sakes and for the sake of our country, that they may be performed greatly. I give to them that counsel which I have ever given to youth, and which I believe to be the wisest and the best—I tell them to aspire. I believe that the man who does not look up will look down; and that the spirit that does not dare to soar is destined perhaps to grovel. Every individual is entitled to aspire to that position which he believes his faculties qualify him to occupy. I know there are some who look with what I believe to be a short-sighted timidity and false prudence upon such views. They are apt to tell us—"Beware of filling the youthful mind with an impetuous tumult of turbulent fancies; teach him, rather, to be content with his position—do not induce him to fancy that he is that which he is not, or to aspire to that which he cannot achieve." In my mind, these are superficial delusions. He who enters the world finds his level. It is the solitary being, the isolated individual alone in his solitude, who may be apt to miscalculate his powers, and misunderstand his character. But action teaches him the truth, even if it be a stern one. Association offers him the best criticism in the world, and I will venture to say that if he belong to the Athenæum, though when he enters it he may think himself a genius, if nature has not given him a creative and passionate soul, before a week has elapsed he will become a very sober-minded individual. I wish to damp no youthful ardour. I can conceive what opportunities such an institution as this would have afforded to the suggestive mind of a youthful Arkwright. I can conceive what a nursing-mother such an institution must have been to the brooding genius of your illustrious and venerated Dalton. It is the asylum of the self-formed; it is the counsellor of those who want counsel, but it is not a guide that will mislead, and it is the last place that will fill the mind of man with false ideas and false conceptions. He reads a newspaper, and his conceit oozes out after reading a leading article. He refers to the library, and the calm wisdom of centuries and sages moderates the rash impulse of juvenescence. He finds new truths in the lecture-room, and he goes home with a conviction that he is not so learned as he imagined. In the discussion of a great question with his equals in station, perhaps he finds he has his superiors in intellect. These are the means by which the mind of man is brought to a healthy state, by which that self-knowledge that always has been lauded by sages may be most securely attained. It is a rule of universal virtue, and from the senate to the counting-house will be found of universal application. Then, to the youth of Manchester, representing the civic youth of this great county and this great district, I now appeal. Let it never be said again that the fortunes of this institution were in danger. Let them take advantage of this hour of prosperity calmly to examine and deeply to comprehend the character of that institution in which their best interests are involved, and which for them may afford a relaxation which brings no pang, and yields information which may bear them to fortune. It is to them I appeal with confidence, because I feel I am pleading their cause—with confidence, because in them I repose my hopes. When nations fall, it is because a degenerate race intervenes between the class that created and the class that is doomed. Let them then remember what has been done for them. The leaders of their community have not been remiss in regard to their interests. Let them remember, that when the inheritance devolves upon them, they are not only to enjoy but to improve. They will some day succeed to the high places of this great community; let them recollect those who lighted the way for them; and when they have wealth, when they have authority, when they have power, let it not be said that they were deficient in public virtue and public spirit. When the torch is delivered to them, let them also light the path of human progress to educated man.

SPEECH TO THE GLASGOW CONSERVATIVE ASSOCIATION.*

MR CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN,—I believe I may describe the position of this country as one of very great prosperity. There is no doubt that during the last three years prosperity has

* Delivered November 22, 1878.

been generally acknowledged. There are some who suppose that it may have received a check at the time when I paid my visit to Glasgow. If it has received a check it will increase, I hope, our circumspection, but I must express my own opinion that no substantial diminution in the sources of the prosperity so apparent during the last three years has occurred. I think we may fairly say the state of this country is one of great prosperity, and although I believe and know that it is a prosperity for which we are not indebted either to Whigs or Tories, although I know that it has been occasioned in a considerable degree, under Providence, by fortuitous though felicitous circumstances, I am perfectly ready, speaking to-day, as I hope to speak, in the fairest terms on public affairs, which I believe to be quite consistent with the position of the leader of a party—I am ready to give to her Majesty's Government credit for the prosperity we feel and acknowledge. With regard to her Majesty's ministers themselves, I will be equally candid, equally fair—I will take them at their own estimate. They have lost few opportunities of informing the country that they are men distinguished for commanding talent, admirable eloquence, and transcendent administrative abilities. I dispute none of these propositions any more than I do the prosperity of the country. They also tell us that the country being so prosperous, and they having all these personal advantages, they have taken the opportunity during the last few years of passing measures of immense magnitude, only equalled by the benefit they have conferred upon the people. Now, gentlemen, I will not question their own estimate of their ability, or even for a moment their own description of their achievements: but I ask this question—What is the reason, when the country is so prosperous, when its affairs are administered by so gifted a Government, and when they have succeeded during five years in passing measures of such a vast character and beneficence — what is the reason that her Majesty's ministers are going about regretting that they are so unpopular? Now, gentlemen, I beg you to observe that I did not say her Majesty's ministers are unpopular. I stated their own case and their own position; I say that under the circumstances I have put fairly before you, it is a remarkable circumstance, and the question must be inquired into —why persons in the position of her Majesty's Government should on every occasion deplore the unpopularity they have incurred. Now, my opinion, gentlemen, is that that is not a question of mere curiosity—it is one that, as I think I shall show you, concerns the honour and the interests of the country. If the country is so prosperous—if her Majesty's ministers are so gifted—if they have had such an ample opportunity of showing the talents which they possess —if they have done all this good—if they have availed themselves of this signal opportunity to effect such great results, then the only inference we can draw from the unpopularity which they themselves deplore is that the people of this country is a fickle and ungrateful people. Therefore, it is not a question of mere curiosity. It is a question that ought to be answered. If there be those who suppose that the people of this country, as I hold, are not a fickle or ungrateful people—that they are a people who may be mistaken—that they may be misled; but that they are a people who, on the whole, are steadfast in their convictions, and especially in their political convictions, I cannot myself for a moment doubt. I say then, that as this question, if left unanswered, would show that her Majesty's ministers have placed a slur on the character of the people of this kingdom, it ought to be answered; and a short time since, some two months ago, I answered it. It appeared to me, at that moment especially, when all those circumstances to which I have referred were clearly before the country, and when her Majesty's Government, by their ablest and most powerful representatives, were deploring their unpopularity, and asking the reason why, or rather intimating by inference that it was the fault of the people, not of the Government, that some one should give an answer to that question. I gave it, and in a very brief form—in the most condensed and the most severely accurate form. There is not an expression in that description of the conduct of the Government which was not well weighed; there was not a word for which I had not warranty, for which I could not adduce testimony ample and abounding. There was only one characteristic of that description which was not noticed at the time, and which I will now confess—it was not original, for six months before in the House of Commons I had used the same expressions and made the same statement —not in a hole or corner, but on the most memorable night of the session, when there were 600 members of the House of Commons present, when on the debate that took place avowedly the fate of the ministry depended. It was at midnight that I rose to speak, and made the statement almost similar in expression, though perhaps stronger and more lengthened than the one which has become the cause of recent controversy. The Prime Minister followed me in that debate. The House of Commons knew what was depending upon the verdict about to be taken, and with all that knowledge they came to a division, and by a majority terminated the existence of the Government. Gentlemen, it surprises me, then, that, having made that statement six months after, with the advantage of six months' more experience and observation, it should have so much offended her Majesty's Government. The ministers sighed, and their newspapers screamed. The question I have to ask, and in this your interests are vitally con-

cerned—the question is, was the statement I made a true and accurate one? You cannot answer statements of this kind by saying, "Oh, fie! how very rude." You must at least adduce arguments in order to prove that the statement which you do not sanction is one that ought not to have been made. And therefore I ask you to-day, in the first place, is it or is it not true that the Irish Church has been despoiled? Is it or is it not true that the gentlemen of Ireland have been severely amerced? Is it or is it not true that a Royal Commission has been issued which has dealt with the ancient endowments of this country in so ruthless a manner that Parliament has frequently been called upon to interfere, and has addressed the Crown to arrest their propositions? Are these facts or are they not? Well, I did then venture to say that they had "harassed trades and worried professions," as reasons why men naturally become unpopular. Was that true or was it not? Because, after all, everything depends on the facts of the statement. I won't enter into a long catalogue of trades, commencing with the important trade of which we have heard so much, and which has made itself felt at so many elections, down to the humblest trade—the lucifer-match makers—who fell upon their knees in Palace Yard. I suppose there are some Scotch farmers present, or, at least, those who are intimately connected with them. I want to know whether trade was harassed when a proposition was brought before the House of Commons to tax their carts and horses, and all the machinery of their cultivation? I know how the proposition was received in England, and I doubt not the Scotch farmers, like the English, felt extremely harassed by it. I want to know what is the reason why there is this crusade throughout the country against schedule D of the Income Tax. The Income Tax has been borne for thirty years with great self-sacrifice and with great loyalty by the people of this country. It is at this moment at the lowest pitch it has ever reached; how is it, then, that it is at this moment more unpopular than it was at any time during the long period we endured it at a much higher figure? It is on account of the assessment of the trades of England under that schedule. It is the vexatious and severe assessment that has harassed tradesmen, who, like all those who come under that Act, are not particularly pleased, when they are paying five quarters of Income Tax in the year, to learn also that they are in arrears. Then, have the professions been worried? Ask the military profession—Is it not true that at this moment a Royal Commission is examining in London into the grievances of six thousand officers? Ask the naval profession whether they have not been worried. During the course of the present Government the whole administrative system of the Admiralty, the council that had always great influence in the management of the navy, and the peculiar office of the secretary, were all swept away; and in spite I may say of the nightly warnings of a right hon. friend who is now lost to us all and his country, the ablest minister of the Admiralty during the present reign—notwithstanding his nightly warnings that they were so conducting the administration of the navy that they would probably fall into some disaster, his remonstrances were in vain, till soon the most costly vessel of the State was lost, and the perilous voyage of the "Megæra" had been made, when the country would stand it no longer. They rescinded the whole of this worrying arrangement, and appointed a new First Lord to re-establish the old system. Is that worrying a profession, or is it not? Well, gentlemen, I can speak of another profession—a profession the most important in the State—the Civil Service profession. Has it been worried? Is it now in a process of worrying, or is it not? There are many even in this room well acquainted with the position of the Civil Service in all its departments. I might say the same of the legal profession, for I have heard lawyers on both sides of the House in the debates of last session agree in imploring the Government not to continue propositions which would infallibly weaken the administration of justice in this country. It is not only these professions and trades who are directly attacked, but it is every one that is harassed, because no one knows whose turn will come next. Well, I did say to the House of Commons—and I afterwards expressed it in another form—I said they had attacked every class and institution from the highest to the lowest in the country. Is that true or is it not? Is it not a fact that her Majesty's Government on every occasion of which they could avail themselves during the last three years attacked the authority of the House of Lords, scoffed at the existence of its high functions, and even defied its decisions, until the result proved that the House of Lords was extremely popular in the country, and her Majesty's Government were obliged to confess that they themselves were exceedingly unpopular? But you must remember this, that the same body who attacked the House of Lords also brought in a bill which would have attacked the poor inheritance of the widow and the orphan. Now, I think I have shown from the highest to the lowest the same system prevailed. What occurred in the interval? The Churches of England and Scotland have been threatened. It has been publicly said by the highest authority in the House of Commons that he did not believe that the House of Commons would sanction the views of those who wished to pull down the venerable establishments, but he recommended them to agitate out of doors and endeavour to excite public opinion against them. Then, again, I said jobs were perpetrated that outraged public opinion. Is

that true, or is it not? Is it not a fact that two years ago the whole country was outraged by persons being appointed to important offices in Church and State in direct violation of the language of Acts of Parliament?—that the ministry in that respect exercised that dispensing power which forfeited the crown of James II.? Was not public indignation roused to the highest degree upon the Collier appointment and a similar one? Were these acts perpetrated, and did they outrage public opinion? Every one knows from his own individual experience that public opinion was outraged. I have said, also, that they stumbled into errors which were always discreditable and sometimes ruinous. That was called violent language. Gentlemen, I never use violent language; violent language is generally weak language; but I hope my language is sometimes strong. Now, let us look at this statement. I said that they stumbled into errors which were always discreditable and sometimes ruinous. Was the Zanzibar contract not an "error," and was it not "discreditable?" Was the conduct of the Treasury in allowing a subordinate officer to misappropriate nearly a million of the public money not an "error," and was it not "discreditable?" When the Government had referred the Alabama Claims to the arbitrament of a third state, was not the change of the law of nations by the three rules an "error?" Was that not "discreditable," and in its consequences was it not "ruinous?"

I have now given an answer to the question why the Government, with transcendent abilities, as they tell us, with magnificent exploits which they are always extolling, and with a country whose prosperity is so palpable—they ask us why they are unpopular, and I tell them why. They have harassed and worried the country, and there was no necessity for any of the acts they have committed. I have put it in condensed and, I am sure, accurate language. There was an illustrious writer, one of the greatest masters of our language, who wrote the history of the last four years of the reign of Queen Anne, which was the duration of an illustrious ministry. I have written the history of a ministry that has lasted five years, and I have immortalised the spirit of their policy in five lines. And now, gentlemen, I will tell you what is the unfortunate cause of this political embarrassment; why, with such favourable circumstances as the present Government have encountered; why, with the great ability which no man is more conscious than myself that they possess; why, with the most anxious and earnest desire, for which I give them entire credit, to do their duty to their sovereign and their fellow-countrymen, the result has been so mortifying. I told it two years ago to the assembled county of Lancaster, when I met not only the greatest proprietors of the soil, but deputations and delegations of the choicest citizens from every town and city of that great county. I told them, speaking with the sense of the deepest responsibility, which, I trust, also animates me now—I told them that the cause was that this Government, unfortunately, in its beginning, had been founded on a principle of violence, and that fatal principle had necessarily vitiated their whole course. And what have we gained by that principle of violence? Let us consider it, here even, with impartiality and perfect candour. I am now referring to the Irish policy of the ministry. I say it is quite possible for public men, with the view of obtaining some great object advantageous to the country, to devise and pass measures which may utterly fail in accomplishing their purpose, and yet, however mortifying to themselves, however disappointing to the country, there would be no stain upon their reputation. We cannot command, but we must endeavour in public life to deserve success. If, therefore, it is said that the Government proposed the large measures which they did with respect to Ireland in order to terminate the grievances of years and the embarrassment to England, which the state of Ireland certainly was, although they may have failed, their position was one which still might be a position of respect. That they have failed in this instance no one can doubt. A great portion of Ireland at this moment is in a state of veiled rebellion. But what I charge upon the Government is this, not that their measures fail—for all measures may fail—not that their measures fail to prevent or to suppress this veiled rebellion in Ireland, but that their measures, which they brought forward to appease and settle, to tranquillise and consolidate Ireland, are the very cause that this veiled rebellion is taking place. For, gentlemen, what was the principle upon which the whole of their policy with respect to Ireland was founded? What was the principle upon which they induced Parliament to confiscate and to despoil Church and private property in Ireland? It was that Ireland must be governed on Irish principles—the administration of Ireland must be carried on with reference to Irish feeling. If that is a sound principle and a sound sentiment in politics, it is a perfect vindication of what is occurring in the city of Dublin at this moment—viz., an assembly of men whose great and avowed object is to dissever the connection between the two countries. If we are not to legislate for Ireland with reference to imperial feelings and general and national interests—if we are only to legislate with reference to Irish feelings, it is perfectly evident that if there is a majority of the Irish people who may take any idea in the world into their heads, however ruinous to themselves and however fatal to the empire, that policy must be recognised by this country. It is, therefore, to that principle, avowedly and ostentatiously brought forward

by the ministry as the basis of their Irish policy, that I trace the dangerous condition in which Ireland is now placed. Well, then, I say this policy of violence for which such sacrifices were made, for which institutions and interests which were, at least, faithful to Britain were sacrificed —this policy of violence has led only to a state of affairs, unfortunately, more unsatisfactory than that which prevailed before.

Now, gentlemen, I observe in the paper that the day is fixed for the re-assembling of Parliament. The time is not yet very near, but when you find her Majesty has appointed the day for our re-assembling, it is an intimation that we must begin to consider the public business a little, and, therefore, it is not altogether inconvenient that we should be talking upon these matters to-day. Now, when we meet Parliament, I apprehend the first business that will be brought before us will be the Ashantee War. Upon that subject my mouth is closed. I will not even make an observation upon the railway which I believe has been returned to England. Whenever this country is externally involved in a difficulty, whatever I may think of its cause or origin, those with whom I act, and myself, have no other duty to fulfil but to support the existing Government in extricating the country from its difficulties and vindicating the honour and interests of Great Britain. The time will come, gentlemen, no doubt, when we shall know something of the secret history of that mysterious mess of the Ashantee War, but we have now but one duty to fulfil, which is to give every assistance to the Government in order that they may take those steps which the interests of the country require. I should indeed, myself, from my own individual experience, be most careful not to follow the example which one of the most distinguished members of the present administration pursued with respect to us when we had to encounter the Abyssinian difficulty. Mr Lowe thought proper to rise in Parliament when I introduced the necessity of interference in order to escape from difficulties which we had inherited and not created. Mr Lowe rose in Parliament and violently attacked the Government of the day for the absurdity, the folly, the extreme imprudence of attempting any interference in the affairs of Abyssinia. He laughed at the honour of the country, he laughed at the interests of a few enslaved subjects of the Queen of England being compared, as he said, with the certain destruction and disaster which must attend any interference on our part. He described the horrors of the country and the terrors of the climate. He said there was no possibility by which any success could be obtained, and the people of England must prepare themselves for the most horrible catastrophe. He described not only the fatal influences of the climate, but I remember he described one pink fly alone, which he said would eat up the whole British army. He was as vituperative of the insects of Abyssinia as if they had been British workmen.

Now, gentlemen, there is a most interesting and important subject which concerns us all, and which it is not impossible may be submitted to the consideration of Parliament by her Majesty's ministers, because I observe a letter published in a newspaper by the authority of the Prime Minister, which is certainly calculated to arrest public attention. That is a letter respecting the subject of parliamentary reform. I think it is not undesirable that at a moment when letters of this kind are circulated, and when there is a good deal of loose talking prevalent in the country on the subject, that I should take this opportunity of calling your attention to some considerations on this subject which may occupy you after my visit to Glasgow has terminated, and may not be, I think, unprofitable. Her Majesty's Government are not pledged, but after the letter of the Prime Minister announcing his own opinion, and the indication of the probability of the Government considering the question of further parliamentary reform, there are two points which the Government ought to consider when they come to that question. The first is the expediency of having any further parliamentary reform. They will have to remember that very wise statesmen have been of opinion that there is no more dangerous and feeble characteristic of a state than perpetually to be dwelling on what is called organic change. The habit, it has been said in politics, of perpetually considering your political constitution can only be compared to that of the individual who is always considering the state of his health and his physical constitution. You know what occurs in such circumstances—he becomes infirm and valetudinarian. In fact, there is a school of politics which looks at the English constitution as valetudinarian. They are always looking at its tongue and feeling its pulse, and devising means by which they may give it a tonic. The Government will have to consider that very important point, first of all whether it is expedient. I am not giving any opinion upon it—being only a private Member of Parliament, that is quite unnecessary—but I am indicating the consideration that would occur to a responsible statesman. They will also have to consider this important point, that whatever minister embarks in a campaign of parliamentary reform must make up his mind that he will necessarily arrest the progress of all other public business in the country. I will show you to what extent that consideration should prevail. Parliamentary reform, as a new question, was introduced in the House of Commons in 1852 by Lord John Russell, and from 1852 to 1866, or the end of 1865, it was introduced annually; four Prime Ministers had pledged themselves to the expediency of parliamentary reform; the subject

made no progress in Parliament, but took up a great deal of time; a great portion of the parliamentary sessions for these twelve or thirteen years was taken up by discussions on parliamentary reform; and the country got very ill-tempered, finding that no reform was ever advanced, and other and more important subjects were neglected. At last it was taken up by men determined to carry it—first by Lord Russell, who did not carry it, and afterwards by others; but, observe, the whole of 1866, 1867, and 1868 were entirely absorbed by the subject of parliamentary reform. Therefore, you will observe that when important subjects in legislation are neglected you must be prepared to discourage any further demand for parliamentary reform unless you feel an insuperable necessity for it, because if you want parliamentary reform you cannot have any of those great measures with regard to local taxation or other subjects in which you are all so much interested. That is the first consideration for the Government of the present day to determine, whether they shall embark in the question of parliamentary reform. Is it necessary? Is the necessity of such a character that it outweighs the immense inconvenience of sacrificing all other public and progressive measures for the advancement of this particular measure? Then there comes another subject of consideration. I dwell upon these subjects because I apprehend that one of the reasons of our meeting this evening is that upon questions which are likely to engage the public attention so far as those whom you honour with your confidence can give you any guidance, it is as well that I should indicate to you briefly my general views of the situation. The next point therefore, that Government will have to consider if they make up their minds to bring forward a measure of parliamentary reform, is the character of the measure, and that will be a most anxious question for them to decide. I think I may say without conceit that the subject of parliamentary reform is one that I am entitled to speak upon at least with some degree of authority. I have given to it the consideration of some forty years, and am responsible for the most important measure on the subject that has been carried. I would say this, that it is impossible to go further in the direction of parliamentary reform than the bill of 1867-68 without entirely subverting the whole of the borough representation of this country. I do not mean to say that if there was a place disfranchised to-morrow for corruption, it would not be possible to enfranchise a very good place in its stead; but, speaking generally, you cannot go beyond the Act of 1867 without making up your mind entirely to break up the borough representation of this country. The people of Great Britain ought to be aware that that is the necessary consequence. So far as I am concerned I never could view the matter in a party light. If I were to accustom myself to view it in a party light, I might look with unconcern on this difficulty, for the smaller boroughs of the country are not, on the whole, favourable to our views. I am proud to think our party is supported by the great counties, and now to a great extent by great towns and cities; but I do not consider the smaller boroughs favourable to Conservative views. It is the national sympathies and wide sentiments of those who live in our great cities that are much more calculated to rally round the cause in which we are deeply concerned—the greatness and glory of our country. This ought to be known, that if those who intend to have a further measure of parliamentary reform, and have digested that large meal which they had a few years ago, they should remember that there is no borough in England with under 40,000 inhabitants that would have any claim to be represented even by one member. Now that is a very im ortant consideration if, as we are told, the small boroughs of between ten and fifteen thousand inhabitants are the backbone of the Liberal party. They may be, and I think they are, but I should be very sorry to see them disfranchised, for they are centres of public spirit and intelligence in the country, influencing very much the districts in which they are situated, and affording a various representation of the mind and life of the country. But it is inevitable that that would occur, and I think, therefore, it ought to be well understood by the country when you hear persons without the slightest consideration saying they are prepared to vote for this, or in favour of that, whereas they have not really mastered the question in any degree whatever. So far as I am concerned, any proposition to change the representation of the people brought forward by her Majesty's Government will receive my respectful and candid consideration. But I say at once that I will vote for no measure of that kind, or of that class which is brought forward by some irresponsible individual who, on the eve of a general election, wants to make a clap-trap career. I think it is perfectly disgusting for individuals to jump up in the House of Commons without the slightest responsibility, official or moral, and make propositions which demand the gravest consideration of prolonged and protracted cabinets, with all the responsibility attaching to experienced statesmen. Now, gentlemen, although I have rather exceeded the time I had intended, there are one or two more remarks I should like to make on subjects which interest us all. And first, as the only feature in our domestic life that gives me uneasiness, are the relations at present between capital and labour, and between the employers and employed. I must say one word upon that subject. If there are any relations in the world which should be those of sympathy and perfect confidence, they always appear to be the relations which should subsist

between employers and employed, and especially in manufacturing life. They are, in fact, much more intimate and more necessary relations than those which subsist between landlords and tenants. It is an extremely painful thing that of late years we so frequently hear of misunderstandings between the employers and the employed—that they look upon each other with suspicion—with mutual suspicion—as if each were rapaciously inclined either to obtain or retain the greater share of the profits of their trade; and those incidents with which you are all acquainted, of a very painful nature, have been the consequence. I am not talking of demands for an increase of wages when men are carrying on what is called a roaring trade—I believe that is the classical epithet taken from the Manchester school. When a roaring trade is going on, I am not at all surprised that working men should ask for an increase of wages. But a trade sometimes ceases to roar, when wages naturally, on the same principle, assume a form more adapted to the circumstances. No doubt, during the last twenty years there appears to have been, not a passing and temporary cause of disturbance like the incidents of trade being very active or reduced, but some permanent cause disturbing prices, which alike confuses the employer in his calculations as to profits and embarrasses the employed from the greater expenditure which they find it necessary to make. Now, I cannot but feel myself—having given to the subject as much consideration as I could—I cannot help feeling that the large and continuous increase of the precious metals, especially during the last twenty years, has certainly produced no inconsiderable effect—not only in trade, but no inconsiderable effect in prices. I will not, on an occasion like this, enter into anything like an abstruse discussion. I confine myself to giving my opinion and the results which I draw from it; and this moral, which I think is worthy of consideration. If it can be shown accurately and scientifically that there is a cause affecting a prominent class, reducing the average remuneration of the employed, and confusing and confounding the employer in his calculations as to profits—if that can be shown, and if it is proved to be the result of inexorable laws, far beyond the reach of legislation, and of circumstances over which human beings have no control—I think if that could be shown, and employers and employed had sufficient acuteness and knowledge—and I am sure that in Scotland both will have to acknowledge that result—it would very much change those mutual feelings of suspicion and sentiments of a not pleasant character which occasionally prevail when they find that they are both of them the victims, as it were, of some inexorable law of political economy which cannot be resisted. I think, instead of supposing that each wanted to take advantage of the other, they would feel inclined to put their shoulders to the wheel, accurately ascertain whether this be true, and come to some understanding which would very much mitigate the relations which subsist between them, and I have little doubt the effect would be to increase the average rate of wages, with my views as to the effect of the continuous increase of the precious metals. But, at the same time, I have not the slightest doubt the employer would, in the nature of things, find adequate compensation for the new position in which he would find himself. There is one point before I sit down to which I wish to call your attention, because if I am correct in saying that the question of the relations between the employer and employed is the only one that gives me anxiety at home, there is a subject abroad to which, I think, I ought, on an occasion like this, to draw your notice; and that is the contest that is commencing in Europe between the spiritual and temporal powers. Gentlemen, I look upon it as very grave, as pregnant with circumstances which may greatly embarrass Europe. The religious sentiment is often and generally taken advantage of by political classes who use it as a pretext; and there is much going on in Europe at the present moment which, it appears to me, may occasion us soon much anxiety in this community. I should myself look upon it as the greatest danger to civilisation if, in the struggle that is going on between faith and free thought, the respective sides should only be represented by the papacy and the red republic; and here I must say that if we have before us the prospect of struggles—perhaps of wars and anarchy, ultimately—caused by the great question that is now rising in Europe, it will not easily be in the power of England entirely to withhold herself from such circumstances. Our connection with Ireland will then be brought painfully to our consciousness, and I should not be at all surprised if the visor of Home Rule should fall off some day, and you beheld a very different countenance. Now, gentlemen, I think we ought to be prepared for those circumstances. The position of England is one which is indicative of dangers arising from holding a middle course upon those matters. It may be open to England again to take a stand upon the Reformation which three hundred years ago was the source of her greatness and her glory, and it may be her proud destiny to guard civilisation alike from the withering blast of atheism and from the simoon of sacerdotal usurpation. These things may be far off, but we live in a rapid age, and my apprehension is that they are nearer than some suppose. If that struggle comes we must look to Scotland to aid us. It was once, and I hope is still, a land of liberty, of patriotism, and of religion. I think the time has come when it really should leave off mumbling the dry bones of political economy and munching the

remainder biscuit of an effete Liberalism. We all know that a general election is at hand. I do not ask you to consider on such an occasion the fate of parties or of ministers. But I ask you to consider this, that it is very probable that the future of Europe depends greatly on the character of the next Parliament of England. I ask you, when the occasion comes, to act as becomes an ancient and famous nation, and give all your energies for the cause of faith and freedom.

WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE.

1809- ——.

THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH IN IRELAND.*

[MR GLADSTONE's first appearance in the House is interesting, when taken in connection with his after-career. In "Random Recollections of the House of Commons," published in 1838, we are furnished with the following sketch: "Mr Gladstone, the member for Newark, is one of the most rising young men on the Tory side of the House. His party expect great things from him; and, certainly, when it is remembered that his age is only thirty-five, the success of the parliamentary efforts he has already made justified their expectations. He is well informed on most of the subjects which usually occupy the attention of the legislature, and he is happy in turning his information to a good account. He is ready on all occasions which he deems fitting ones, with a speech in favour of the policy advocated by the party with whom he acts. His extemporaneous resources are ample. Few men in the House can improvisate better. It does not appear to cost him an effort to speak. He is a man of very considerable talent, but has nothing approaching to genius. His abilities are much more the result of an excellent education, and of mature study, than of any prodigality on the part of nature in the distribution of her mental gifts. I have no idea that he will ever acquire the reputation of a great statesman. His views are not sufficiently profound or enlarged for that; his celebrity in the House of Commons will chiefly depend on his readiness and dexterity as a debater, in conjunction with the excellence of his elocution, and the gracefulness of his manner when speaking. His style is polished, but has no appearance of the effect of previous preparation. He displays considerable acuteness in replying to an opponent. He is quick in his perception of anything vulnerable in the speech to which he replies, and happy in laying the weak point bare to the gaze of the House. He now and then indulges in sarcasm, which is, in most cases, very felicitous. He is plausible even when most in error. When it suits himself or his party, he can apply himself with the strictest closeness to the real point at issue; when to evade that point is deemed most politic, no man can wander from it more widely. . . . Mr Gladstone's appearance and manners are much in his favour. He is a fine-looking man. He is about the usual height, and of a good figure. His countenance is mild and pleasant, and has a highly intellectual expression. His eyes are clear and quick. His eyebrows are dark and rather prominent. There is not a dandy in the House but envies what Truefit would call his 'fine head of jet-black hair.'"]

The motion, sir, which, in concluding, I shall propose to the committee is, that the chairman be directed to move the House that leave be given to bring in a bill to put an end to the Established Church in Ireland, and to make provision in respect of the temporalities thereof, and in respect of the Royal College of Maynooth. I do not know, sir, whether I should be accurate in describing the subject of this resolution as the most grave and arduous work of legislation that ever has been laid before the House of Commons; but I am quite sure I should speak the truth if I confined myself to asserting that there has probably been no occasion when the disproportion was so great between the demands of the subject that is to be brought before you, and the powers of the person whose duty it is to submit it. I will not, however, waste time in apologies that may be considered futile, and the more so because I am conscious that the field I have to traverse is a very wide one, and that nothing but the patient favour and kindness of the committee can enable me in any degree to attain the end I have in view—namely, that of submitting with fulness and with clearness both the principles and the details of a measure which, as far as regards its principles, is singularly arduous, and, as far as regards its details, must necessarily embrace matter of a character highly complex and diverse.

Now, I cannot but be aware that, under ordinary circumstances, one who undertakes to introduce to the House of Commons a subject of grave constitutional change ought to commence by laying his ground strongly and broadly in historical and political reasons. On this occa-

* Delivered in the House of Commons, March 1, 1869.

sion I shall feel myself in the main dispensed from entering upon them. Under ordinary circumstances, in discussing the subject of the Church of Ireland—I mean had nothing already occurred in this House or elsewhere in relation to it on which I might take my stand—I should endeavour to pass in review the numerous, I might say the numberless and powerful arguments which, in my opinion, may be adduced to prove that this Establishment cannot continue to exist with advantage to itself or without mischief to the country. I should be prepared to show how many benefices there are in Ireland where, although there is a church population, it can hardly be said to be more than an official church population, for the members of these benefices are too often restricted to those whom we may reasonably suppose to be supplied by the families of the clergyman, the clerk, and the sexton. I should show, sir, how buttresses have been devised for the maintenance of this extraordinary system in the shape of those grants from the consolidated fund in this country, on the one hand to the Presbyterians under the form of the *Regium Donum*, and on the other hand to the Roman Catholics under the form of the Maynooth grant, without which it was felt that the maintenance of such an Establishment in Ireland would be intolerable and impossible. I should endeavour to show how Parliament has been so conscious of the difficulties attending the position which it has held that it has actually been reduced upon more than one occasion to waste away, by positive provisions of legislation, the property of the Church, in order that its magnitude compared with the duties might not too much shock the public mind. I should endeavour to show how in past times, and through all the evil years of the penal legislation that has affected Ireland, the authorities of this Established Church have unfortunately stood in the foremost rank with respect to the enactment of those laws on which we cannot look back without shame and sorrow.

Sir, of the Established Church in Ireland I will only say that, although I believe its spirit to have undergone an immense change since those evil times, yet, unfortunately, it still remains, if not the home and the refuge, yet the token and the symbol of ascendency, and, so long as that Establishment lives, painful and bitter memories of ascendency can never die. But, sir, instead of lengthened discussion upon this and kindred topics, I hope I shall be sufficiently justified in passing at once to the measure of the Government by a reference to recent occurrences. In form, without doubt, this is the first, the very first stage of a great political measure, liable and open at every point to controversy; but in substance we cannot dismiss from our view that we are virtually taking up and are bound to prosecute the unfinished labours of last year.

I refer to those debates which formed the main, almost the only, subject of party difference in the discussions of this House during the session of 1868. I refer to the large majority which in a House of Commons undoubtedly Conservative in its general spirit affirmed, notwithstanding, the necessity of bringing the system of religious establishment in Ireland to a close. I refer to the autumn spent in incessant discussions of this subject before every constituency in the country. I refer to the elections in which the issue so clearly put was not less decisively answered. And lastly, but not least, I refer to that resignation of the late administration on which I have not to pronounce one word of censure, but about which I am sure I am justified in stating that it was an unusual course. I have not one word of censure to utter, but assuredly I am justified in saying that it forms the most emphatic testimony to the character of that judgment which has already been pronounced by the representatives and by the people of the three kingdoms. Nor shall I dwell in any detail upon the counter-arguments which have been ably, sincerely, and persistently used in defence of the Established Church. If I name them, it is to do little more than to say that we are responsible for this measure, and we who on this side are pledged to its general principles shall be ready upon every due occasion, with all respect to those who oppose us, to meet those counter-arguments.

It is said that the measure we are about to introduce will be adverse to religion. I believe it to be favourable, to be essential to the maintenance of those principles of right on which every religion must rest. We shall be told, more especially, that it is adverse to the interests of Protestantism; but we shall point to the condition of Ireland, and shall argue from the facts of that condition that the interests of Protestantism have not been promoted, but on the contrary have been injured by our perseverance in a system which reason does not justify. We shall be told, perhaps, that we are invading the rights of property. No possible confidence can be greater than that with which we shall meet that argument. On former occasions, indeed, things have been done by Parliament, under the extreme pressure of the case, which it may be difficult to reconcile with the extreme assertion of the rights of property. There are clauses, and important clauses, of the Church Temporalities Act of 1833 which greatly strain the abstract theory of property, and which I for one am totally unable to reconcile with its general rules. But, so far as I know, there is no imputation that can fairly be made against the measure we propose with respect to the rights of property by any other persons than those who hold what appears to me the untenable—I may even say the extravagant—doctrine that although Parliament has a perfect right to direct the course of the descent of property in the case of

natural descent, lineage by blood, yet it has no right, when once the artificial existence of what we call a corporation has been created, to control the existence of that corporation or to extinguish it even under the gravest public exigency. Well, we shall be told also of the Act of Union; and I cannot, nor shall I attempt to dissemble that on a point which has been described as essential we propose to alter that Act. The Act of Union has been altered on other occasions, though never for so grave a cause as this; but we shall confidently contend that while we are altering this particular provision of the Act of Union, we are confirming its general purport and substance, and labouring to the best of our humble ability to give it those roots which unfortunately it has never yet adequately struck in the heart and affections of the people.

And lastly, sir, this claim I, for one, confidently, boldly, make on behalf of the measure that we are introducing—I say we are giving effect to the spirit of a former policy. The great minister who proposed the Act of Union neither said nor believed that it would be possible under a legislative union to maintain the system of religious inequality which he found subsisting in Ireland. On the contrary, he has left upon record his strong conviction that the countenance and support afforded from national sources to the Established Church must be extended to other religions of the country. I admit that we pursue religious equality by means different from those proposed by Mr Pitt, but by means, as I believe, better suited to the purpose we have in view, and certainly more consonant to the spirit, to the opportunities, and to the possibilities of the times in which we live. Be that, however, as it may, and with all that allowance for difference of means, the end we have in view is the same, and for that end we are entitled to quote his great authority, and the authority of many of those who have followed him in their public career.

Sir, having referred to what I venture to call —although not in any technical or formal sense —the previous stages of this measure, I will briefly remind the committee of the character of the general declarations by which the late House of Commons was moved to action, and of those pledges—for I do not hesitate to recognise them in that capacity—which we are now called upon to do our best to redeem. I think, sir, it was well understood to be the view of those who supported the resolutions of last year that the system of Church Establishment in Ireland must be brought thoroughly and completely to a close —that although the word "disendowment" was never embodied in any resolution of this House, nor, so far as I recollect, was ever accepted without qualification in the speeches of those who most prominently supported it, yet, as a general rule and for every substantial purpose and effect, an end must likewise be put to the system of the public endowment of religion in Ireland. While the principles of the measure were laid thus broad and deep, it was likewise professed, and I think to a great degree accepted by the House, that in all the details, in all the modes of application, the rules not only of justice but of equity, and not only of equity, but, within every reasonable limit, even of indulgence, should be followed.

And while the measure was thus to be thorough and thus to be liberal, there were two other great characteristics which, in order fully to realise the desire we entertain, it ought to possess. The first of these, sir, is, in my judgment, that the measure ought to be prompt in its operation; for it is not for the interest of those with whom we deal any more than it is for the interest of the country that—I will not say the Irish Church, but—the Irish Establishment should be subjected to the pain of a lingering death. That promptitude of operation cannot be absolute; it must necessarily be checked by considerations arising out of the vested interests with which we have to deal. But yet, subject to those rules of right and of prudence, it is an object which we ought to have in view in the prosecution of our work. And lastly, sir, there is another characteristic which perhaps has hardly yet been mentioned in debate, but which appears to me second to none in its importance as determining the value of the provisions of a measure such as this. It is that the legislation which we now propose, so far as the Irish Church is concerned, so far as the subjects of religious controversy growing out of legislative establishment in the sister island are concerned, shall be final legislation—that it shall put away, out of sight, out of hearing, out of mind if it may be, this long-continued controversy—a controversy almost of generations; and that even should it necessarily happen, as commonly happens in the train of great statutes, that in this or that point of detail it may require to be either developed or amended, yet the bill which we propose shall leave no question of principle unsolved, and shall permit every man who takes part in its discussion to hope that when it finally departs from within the walls of Parliament we shall have heard the very last and latest of the controversy on the Irish Church.

Subject, then, to those great principles, it is our duty—and I am sure it will be recognised to be our duty—to seek every means of softening the transition that is about to be effected. We must not disguise from ourselves that we are calling upon persons, upon large classes, upon individuals entitled to great respect, to undergo a great change in their position under the direct action of law. And every motive that can appeal to the feelings of men of honour and of gentlemen must lead us, I think, to feel it a duty so to proceed that this measure shall carry with it no unnecessary penalty or pain. Sir, I

am bound to say that I think many of those who may be expected and considered to take a special interest in this measure have given us in this respect much encouragement. There are many eminent persons in Ireland connected with the Church who have shown a great disposition to meet us in the fair field of discussion, to recognise the judgment which has been pronounced at the tribunal of the nation, and to endeavour to arrive at a just and equitable settlement. Nay more, even upon that Episcopal bench of England, from which oftentimes no sounds but those of persistent resistance have proceeded, there have been signs upon very recent occasions of a sense that it is their duty to look to the future interests of the Church as well as of the Establishment—of the religion as well as of the property with which it is endowed. And those counsels of moderation, which impose on us corresponding obligations, are likely to prevail, as we may hope, in those quarters during the coming discussions. In Ireland it has, indeed, been left only to one single prelate—the Bishop of Down—among the Episcopal order boldly to take his stand on behalf of the principle of settlement and accommodation; but yet I cannot but hope and believe that there are many, even among his Episcopal brethren, who are by no means disposed to prolong this hopeless struggle or to make demands upon Parliament, as terms of surrender, which it would be impossible for Parliament to grant.

And now, sir, I think I may say that I will not trouble the committee further upon general considerations connected with this measure, but will at once proceed to use the best efforts in my power to convey its character and all its leading provisions to the minds of the committee as nearly as I can in the same light and in the same form as they present themselves to the minds of the Government. And I think, sir, searching for a key by which I may suggest to the gentlemen who hear me the best and most likely method of clearly apprehending the nature of the provisions of the bill which I now hold in my hand, I will venture to direct their attention to the points of time—not, indeed, to all the points of time, because some points of time have of necessity been chosen for secondary and minor purposes—but to the three which I may call essential points of time, with reference to which I will endeavour to state the provisions and operation of the bill so that the committee may have, as far as depends upon me, a clear understanding of the manner in which we shall endeavour to give effect to the judgment of Parliament and of the country.

The first of these points of time, sir, is the passing of the Act, and I will first describe such of the effects of the Act as are to ensue either immediately upon its passing, or in the provisional and preparatory period which will immediately follow its passing. The second of these points of time is a day named in the Act. At present it stands the 1st of January 1871, affording an interval between the passing of the Act—should it, as I trust it will, become law during the present session—of about eighteen months or something less for the preparatory arrangements; but with regard to that day I will presume to say that while we believe it is distinctly for the interest of the Church itself that this intermediate period should not be too long, and while it is the absolute limit of time which we have thought the best, yet it does not constitute a point of the measure to which, in case the limit is found to be too narrow, we should think ourselves irrevocably pledged. The 1st of January 1871, therefore, constitutes the second point of time.

The third point of time is one which we cannot define as a particular date, but I can describe it by stating the events which will bring it about. It is the point of time at which it shall be decided by the proper authorities that all the subsidiary arrangements connected with the winding up of the establishment of the Irish Church have been completed, and that thenceforth nothing remains to be done except to apply the property of the Irish Church which will then have discharged every prior claim upon it, and will remain free for the purposes which Parliament may think fit to indicate.

Begging the committee to bear in mind these three points of time, I will now proceed to describe that portion of the effects of the measure which will follow immediately upon the passing of the bill. It is provided in almost the earliest clauses that the present Ecclesiastical Commission, which was appointed for the purpose of administering the Church Establishment, and not for the purpose of bringing it to an end, shall be wound up. In lieu of it new commissioners will be appointed, whose names we shall at a proper time propose and insert in the bill. We think very highly of the responsibility of their functions, and are very desirous that the men who may be proposed to discharge those functions should be men to whom Parliament shall have already, for the purposes of the measure, given its general approval. We shall propose that this commission shall endure for ten years, estimating, as far as present circumstances permit us to do, that this will be a term ample and sufficient for all the numerous and diversified purposes they will have to prosecute. In this commission, upon the passing of the bill, the entire property of the Church in Ireland will vest, subject to life interests. The committee will at once see the importance of that enactment. As far as legal and technical disendowment is concerned, it will have occurred on the day when the measure has received the royal assent, because there will no longer remain in the Church of Ireland any title whatever to its property other than that of the commissioners.

and other than those temporary titles which we propose that Parliament should recognise. And all the subsequent arrangements which may be found necessary connected with fabrics or with any other points of the question, will be technically in the nature of a re-endowment, and will be brought by me separately under your consideration.

Then, sir, next to the vesting of the property, I have to mention the provision we propose to make for the government and management of the Church during this intermediate period. Last year we proposed and passed through this House a bill which suspended every appointment in Ireland from the day of its falling vacant, and we trusted entirely to collateral and subsidiary provisions of the law to make a supply for the time being of such assistance as might be necessary for the actual discharge of duties until Parliament should give its further judgment. Now, sir, it appears to be plain on the one hand that those provisions, which I think were very well adapted to the object we had in view last year of reserving the whole matter for the further judgment of Parliament, are not so well adapted to the purpose we now have in view—that is, to apply definite legislation to the determination of the whole question. On the other hand, it appears to us to be equally indisputable that there is one thing which we could not consistently or properly allow to be done during this intermediate period. We could not properly allow after the passing of the Act the creation of new vested interests for life. We have therefore endeavoured to steer as fairly as we can between these difficulties; on the one side proposing not to be parties to the creation of new vested interests, which I think every one will see would from our point of view be highly inconsistent, and on the other side being equally anxious that the Irish Church, at a period when all its ministers and members will be called upon to exert themselves to the utmost in preparing for the future, should not be subjected to the disadvantage of a crippled ecclesiastical organisation.

What we therefore propose is, that appointments may be made, generally speaking, to the spiritual offices without investing the person invested with a freehold; that he may receive during the interval the income as nearly as it can be calculated which he would have received if he had taken the freehold in the ordinary course, but that his title to it shall terminate when the provisional period is at an end, and when the links which connect the Establishment with the Church are finally broken. With respect, in particular, to Episcopal appointments, the provision we propose is as follows: We think it is very desirable after once the statute shall have passed for disestablishing the Church to separate the Crown from the exercise of its old prerogative within the Church. We, therefore, propose that Episcopal appointments may be made by the Crown, but only on the prayer of the bishops themselves of the provinces of Ireland to consecrate a particular person to a vacancy. Such appointment, if made, will carry with it no vested interest, nor will it carry with it any right of peerage. The Irish Church being engaged in perfecting its organisation for the future will probably not run the risk of having its sees and rectories vacant, but will have, so to speak, a staff fully adequate to deal with the coming contingency.

With respect to the exercise of Crown patronage as to livings, our view is this—while we take it for granted that at any rate as a general rule these livings would be filled up in the interval, they would be filled up on the same footing as bishoprics. In regard to the temporalities the disposition of the present advisers of the Crown, in making appointments wherever they have by law a right of patronage, would be to be guided within the limits of reason by the advice and recommendation of the ecclesiastical authorities. I think that is all I need say as regards the intermediate system that we shall now propose in lieu of the suspensory clauses of the bill of last year, except that in one point they would correspond more strictly with the provisions of the bill—namely, in this, that the commissioners would be inhibited from laying out money for permanent purposes, such as the building of new churches during the interval, and would only be authorised to expend money for the purpose of substantial repairs, for the fulfilment of engagements actually entered into, and for the necessary charges for the performance of divine worship in the same manner as heretofore. So much for the scheme in relation to suspensory clauses.

The next important enactment which will take effect immediately on the passing of the bill is this. It is well known to the committee that certain disabilities affect the collective action of the clergy, and although the Convocations of England sit and have just been sitting, yet it is not in their power to proceed either to pass, or even to discuss with a view of passing, any canon, or regulation in the nature of a canon, without the assent of the Crown. In Ireland the case is different, and more adverse to the action of the Church, for there the Convocation has in point of fact never acted at all, excepting upon some very few occasions which may be specially pointed out, and the latest of those occasions, if I remember right, was a century and a half, if not fully two centuries ago. But besides the total disuse of that ecclesiastical machinery, and the difficulty in which the Crown is placed when it is called upon to revive or be a party to the revival of that which has never worked at all for two hundred years, and with respect to the working rules of which there are, even among lawyers,

very grave doubts, there are in Ireland special provisions of the law called the Convention Act, which, though passed for purely political purposes, have the effect of preventing the clergy and laity of the Church from meeting in any general assembly. It is understood, I believe, that the clergy and laity of a parish may meet, but that the Church at large is incapacitated from meeting.

Now, it will, I presume, be deemed on both sides of the House to be obviously just and necessary that all disabilities whatsoever which in any manner fetter the action of the Church with reference to legislation for the future—and when I speak of legislation, I mean private legislation with respect to making voluntary contracts and regulations—ought, in passing a Disestablishment Act, to be at once and entirely swept away. When I say that, let it not be supposed I intend to insinuate any opinion to the effect that such a measure either is likely to cause or ought to be desired to cause a religious or spiritual separation between the Church of Ireland and the Church of England. The words of this measure have been carefully considered in reference to the Act of Union, so as to limit, as far as lies in our power, their repealing force to the establishment of those Churches, and we have been very desirous to do nothing which could possibly be held to interfere with their ecclesiastical relationship. At a later period I shall have to state to the committee what we have thought it our duty to propose, in order to prevent any kind of shock to their internal condition. But of this I am persuaded, that the best friends of religious union between the Disestablished Church in Ireland and the Established Church in England will be those who most completely assert the liberty of the former to take its own course. Were we to attempt to apply to them constraint even in the faintest and feeblest form, for the purpose of seeking to secure their union, we should, I believe, engender reaction, even if such a proceeding were not open to the more palpable and obvious objection that, considering the general scope of our bill, it would be totally and radically unjust.

These, I think, are the positive and most important provisions which we propose as provisions which must take effect simultaneously with the passing of the bill. There is, however, another provision, for the operation of which we cannot precisely fix a time, because it does not depend altogether on us, but which this appears to me to be the proper place to mention. Inasmuch as there must necessarily grow out of the present position of the Church in Ireland, its property, and arrangements, a number of measures that in winding up this great system will have to be considered an · discussed between some authority on the part of the State and some authority on the part of the Church, the course which we propose to Parliament to take is this: We presume that during the interval which the bill will create after the disabilities are removed, the bishops, clergy, and laity of the Church of Ireland will proceed to constitute for themselves, in the same manner as other religious communities have done, something in the nature of a governing body. We therefore take by this measure power to her Majesty in Council—not to create such a body, but to recognise it when created, and we seek to avoid making her Majesty the judge, either directly or by implication, whether this body is or is not for all purposes created wisely and well. But in the enacting words of the bill we should direct the attention of the Crown solely to one point—that it must be a representative body, representative alike of the bishops, clergy, and laity. In point of fact, her Majesty's advisers would have to act simply as a jury, and to satisfy themselves that this body so constituted, according to the will and judgment of the Church, fulfilled in good faith the character of a representative body. Her Majesty would then recognise that body as such, and it would become incorporated under the provisions of the Act for the purposes which I shall have presently to describe.

Now, the committee will see how far we have got. We have passed our provisions through the intermediate period, and we are coming to the day fixed in the Act for the principal and final provisions of the bill to take effect. We have got in operation a commission which is to be the organ of the State in giving effect to the whole of our arrangements, and we have given time and every facility which properly belongs to us, not for bringing into operation, but for permitting to come into operation, that organ which we presume the members of the Church of Ireland will appoint in order to transact their share of the complicated business which will remain to be transacted. I now come to the second and most important period of time which stands at present fixed in the bill as the 1st of January 1871. On that day, according to the provisions of the bill, the union created by Act of Parliament between the Churches of England and Ireland would be dissolved, and "the said Church of Ireland hereafter referred to as 'the said Church'"—I am now quoting the bill—would cease to be established by law. There would be at the same time a saving clause in the bill to prevent its having any effect on the Act of Union other than that which is thus strictly limited and defined. On that day the ecclesiastical courts in Ireland would be abolished, the ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Ireland would cease, the ecclesiastical laws in Ireland would no longer bind by any authority as law, the rights of peerage would lapse on the part of the bishops, and all ecclesiastical corporations in that country would be dissolved.

The committee is well aware that the Church itself is not a corporation, but an aggregate of corporations. I am, I believe, strictly accurate in saying that with these provisions in operation on the 1st of January 1871, the work of the disestablishment of the Irish Church would be legally completed. There is, at the same time, a point of great importance, which I think this is the place for me to mention. Though we feel it to be a necessary—and it will, I think, be admitted by the House generally to be necessary—part of such a plan as this that it should at once put an end to the force and authority of ecclesiastical laws, as such, in Ireland, yet we also feel that it is our duty not unnecessarily to subject that religious communion now called the Irish Established Church to shocks and inconveniences with respect to the management of its internal affairs not required by the scope of our measure. It is not our desire that this transition—this great political transition—should be attended with the *maximum*, but rather with the *minimum*, of ecclesiastical change. Whatever ecclesiastical change is made, ought, in our opinion, to be the result of the free deliberate will of the members of the Established Church, and not of the shock inconsiderately imparted by crude legislation to its machinery.

We, therefore, propose that although the ecclesiastical laws shall lose their force as laws, in which respect they have a certain relation to the whole community, yet they shall be understood to subsist as a form of voluntary contract, which shall continue to bind together the bishops, clergy, and laity now constituting the Established Church until and unless they shall be altered by the voluntary agency of the governing body which the members of that communion may appoint. In this way it appears to us that this great launch—and a great launch it undoubtedly is, so far as all the ecclesiastical arrangements, properly so-called, are concerned—will be effected smoothly, and I am, indeed, very conscious that it is desirable, on every ground that it should be so, for there will be quite enough to tax the energy, the prudence, and the courage of the members of the Church of Ireland in making provision for the great change which we are going to bring about in its internal affairs. The committee, having followed me thus far, will have perceived that we have complete technical disendowment on the passing of the Act, and complete and actual disestablishment on the day to be named in the Act, and now standing for the 1st of January 1871.

Next comes a matter on which I fear it will be my duty to detain the committee for some time—the task of carrying out all those special arrangements, by means of which the interests of the parties affected by this great change will have to be settled and adjusted in detail. I am afraid I should, perhaps, alarm the committee were I to state how numerous those arrangements are, but they embrace the vested interests of incumbents—and by the word "incumbent" I wish to be understood as meaning a bishop or a dignitary of the Church, as well as a clergyman having parochial charge—the vested interests of curates, the case of lay and minor offices, the compensation for advowsons; the provisions to be adopted with respect to private endowments, the provisions with respect to churches, with respect to glebe houses, graveyards, all of those, of course, being subject to the life interests recognised by the bill. There are the arrangements connected with the winding-up of the *Regium Donum*, the arrangements connected with the winding-up of Maynooth, the arrangements for disposing of the tithe commutation rent-charge, the arrangements with respect to the large class of property affected by the property-purchase clauses, and the arrangements connected with the sale of the Church lands by the commissioners.

Let me say a word first with respect to that which is the largest of all these subjects—namely, the case of the vested interest of incumbents. Now, the vested interest of the incumbent is quite distinct, on the one hand, from his expectation of promotion. In all cases of the abolition of establishments, be they civil or ecclesiastical, I am afraid that expectation is a matter into which, however legitimate it may be, it is impossible for us to enter. The vested interest of the incumbent, then, is this—it is a title to receive a certain net income from the property of the Church, I say from the property of the Church, because I set apart receipts from pew-rents, receipts from fees, receipts from other casual sources with which it is no business of ours to deal. The vested interest with which we have to deal is the right of the incumbent to be secured in the receipt of a certain annual income from the property of the Church in consideration of the discharge of certain duties to which he is bound as the equivalent he gives for that income, and subject to the laws by which he is bound and the religious body to which he belongs. Therefore the committee will see in what sense it is true that, although the Church at large, and the congregations at large, have no vested interests, and it would be impossible to recognise anything of the kind, yet both the Church and the congregations are very largely concerned in the vested interest of the incumbent, because his title is not a simple, unconditional title to a certain payment of money, but it is a title to a payment of money in consideration of duty. In the performance of that duty the congregations and the Church are deeply concerned; and I think it will be the opinion of the committee that it would be unjust to them to expose them to unnecessary disparagement by worsening the conditions under which they now stand in reference to the clergy.

Such is the vested interest of the clergy; and I may here say that although, as a rule, it is for parents to set examples to children, yet, in the vicissitudes of human affairs, it sometimes happens that children may set a good example to parents. It has happened so in this instance, for the legislature of Canada, having to deal with a case undoubtedly far more simple, far less difficult and complicated than ours, yet, notwithstanding, in this one central and vital subject—the manner of dealing with the vested interests of the clergy upon whose incomes it was legislating, and the permanent source of whose incomes it was entirely cutting off—has undoubtedly proceeded upon principles which appear to balance, or rather to maintain very fairly the balance established between, the separate interests of the clergy and the general interests of the Church to which they belong, and the congregations to which they minister. Substantially, and after allowing for necessary differences of expression, we think the basis afforded by the Canadian measure supplies us with no unsuitable pattern after which to shape our own proceedings.

Such being the case, I will briefly describe to the committee how we propose to deal with the vested interest of the incumbent. The plan will be this: The amount of income to which each incumbent is entitled will be ascertained. It will be made subject to deduction for the curates he may have employed. That I will further explain when I come to the curate. It will be made payable, in the case of each, so long as he discharges the duty. And then there will be a provision that the annuity itself may be commuted upon the basis of capitalising it as an annuity for life. Therefore, the commutation, taking the rate of interest at 3½ per cent., will represent his whole interest in the income he receives, presuming it to last for life. This commutation can only be made upon the application of the incumbent. He must be the prime mover in bringing it about. Upon his application the sum of money will be paid to that which I shall call, for shortness, the Church body, but it will be paid to the Church body subject to the legal trust of discharging the obligation or covenant which we had ourselves to discharge to the incumbent—namely, to give him the annuity in full so long as he discharged the duties. The effect of that plan of commutation will be that, by means of the Church body, and of the inducements that will be given to arrangements between the Church body and the incumbents, we, the State, should escape, as we hope and believe, at a very early period from that which it is undoubtedly not desirable to maintain longer than is absolutely necessary—namely, a direct relation of administrator and recipient between the organs of the State and the individual clergy of the Church. That is the nature of the interest which the State possesses in commutation; and although, undoubtedly, commutation would be an arrangement so far favourable to the Church collectively—and the very same thing will apply *totidem verbis* to the Presbyterians of Ireland—as enabling the Church body and the individual to adjust their relations and to make a more economical application of their resources than would be possible by the maintenance of the original annuities, yet the interest of the State in bringing these transactions to a close will be felt amply to justify and strongly to recommend some arrangement of the kind.

Well, that is the mode in which we should propose to proceed with respect to the great subject of life interests. These life interests are in truth by far the greatest—and, indeed, much greater than all the rest put together—of the demands upon the fund of the Church before it becomes free and available for other purposes. I wish, however, to explain what I have not yet stated—that the recognition of life interests, which would be conditional as regards the performance of the duties that are now the equivalent for the income, would be unconditional in other respects. We should not attempt to interfere, in the main, with the position of the clergyman either as proprietor or occupier of land. In many cases, indeed, as we know, the clergy of Ireland do farm their own glebes. In many cases they let land from year to year. In many cases the land is let upon short leases; and although it would be desirable if we could to bring the clergy to give up the position of landlord as soon as possible, we do not propose to effect this result by any compulsory enactment. Commutation, we think, will offer inducements which will be sufficient for the purpose; but, speaking generally, we do not propose by any compulsory provision in the bill to interfere with the position of the clergyman in relation to any part of his freehold.

There is, however, one exception which I must mention, because it is an exception which, perhaps, has a name and a bulk, though insignificant in every other respect. It is the tithe commutation rent-charge. We propose that the tithe commutation rent-charge shall at once and absolutely, and without any intervening life interest, vest in the commission under the Act, and the reason is that the tithe commutation rent-charge, with the single exception of a certain amount of fluctuation, which, of course, is rather in the nature of an inconvenience than a convenience to the clergyman, is in every other respect a fixed interest; and inasmuch as it is very desirable immediately to put in action certain arrangements respecting it, we propose to take it at once into the hands of the commissioners, the faith of Parliament, of course, being pledged to the payment of the whole proceeds which the clergyman could derive from it. Besides that, there is another

very small exception which we have thought fit to make. I will speak by-and-by of the case of churches which are in use, but there are in Ireland cases of churches wholly ruinous, many in graveyards, but many apart from graveyards. In some cases the freehold may be in the incumbent of the parish. We propose at once to dispossess him of that freehold. It may be desirable that these sites should be disposed of either by throwing them into the burial-grounds or in some other manner, but there can be no advantage in keeping up that barren freehold, which is totally unproductive of practical results to the clergyman, and is purely incidental to his position as clergyman of a Church established by law.

There is another change which would be made immediately upon the disestablishment of the Church, and which it is my duty to bring specially to the notice of the committee, although probably the view of the committee will be not only in favour of the change, but is likely to be that under the circumstances of the case it is inevitable. The committee is aware of the peculiar nature of the title of an Irish bishop to sit in the House of Lords. He has a title to sit there for life, and yet it is an intermittent title. He is not a permanent member of that assembly, but he is placed in a certain legal rotation which brings him there for a session and then dismisses him, in the case of the archbishop for one, and in the case of the bishops for two or three sessions. We have had to ask ourselves whether it is desirable that a right of peerage so singular in its character and operation should continue after the disestablishment of the Church. I own that it is not without some regret and pain that I propose a provision which should seem in the slightest degree to convey a slight or disparagement in point of dignity to individuals who, as such, I believe to be fully and amply worthy of the honours they enjoy in the House of Lords. But the anomaly is so great, and then, again, it is so obvious that the Irish bishops are maintained in the House of Lords for the very purpose of representing a national and an Established Church, that—although not without regret as far as the individuals are concerned—I think we cannot hesitate to propose to the committee that these peerages should lapse with the disestablishment of the Church. It is because this proposal forms a qualification to the broad principle I have laid down as to respecting life interests in their integrity that I have been so particular in calling attention to it.

Well, now, sir, I come to the case of the curates, and I hope the committee will not be shocked at my endeavouring to state clearly the nature of the provisions we propose with regard to this most meritorious class of men, because, wearisome as it must necessarily be to you to pass through such a wilderness of details, yet there are many hundreds of persons for whom this question may be, or at least is believed by them to be, a matter of life or death, and who wait with the keenest anxiety to know the view that has been taken of their case. In speaking of the case of curates, I do not speak simply of those clergymen who have entered into transitory and fluctuating engagements for a week, month, or other short period. I speak of those who are regularly enlisted in the service of the Church as curates, and, in point of fact, are bound to that office by a long life-tenure, unless, as they hope may at some time happen, they should be presented to benefices. I speak of those who in a popular sense I may venture to call the permanent curates of the Irish Church. There is a great deal of difficulty in dealing with this class of persons, but the committee will observe that I am not now asking them to invade the public or the national fund for the purpose of compensation. In the main I am only studying to secure the due application to the benefit of the curate of those deductions which we have already made from the income of the incumbent, when proceeding to calculate his annuity for the purpose of ascertaining his vested interest. We propose to deal with the curates as follows: The commissioners are to determine who are curates permanently employed. In some cases the form of the instrument under which they are employed will adequately determine this point, but in others it would not. We propose to leave the matter to the commissioners, giving also to the incumbent the power of objecting that A. B., his curate, was not permanently employed. It is required, also, in order to enable the curate to take advantage of the provision on this point, that he should have been employed on the 1st of January 1869, and that he continue to be employed on the 1st of January 1871, or that, if he has ceased to be employed, the discontinuance of his employment shall be due to some cause other than his own free choice or misconduct. That will be the test. Being so eligible, he would, *primâ facie*, be entitled to have the interest in his curacy calculated for life, he would have a vested interest in it in the same way as the incumbent has in the income of his living or bishopric, and he would be entitled to have it commuted upon the same terms. He would also be subjected to the corresponding obligation to that which would be imposed on the incumbent—that is to say, he would be bound to continue the duties he now performs until he effects an arrangement for commutation; he would be bound to render the same services to the incumbent that he formerly did, or if he cease to render them, in order to maintain his qualification, that cessation must be due to some other cause than his own misconduct or free choice.

With regard to the curates of a more transitory class, we have a provision in the bill which appears to us a fair analogy to a similar provision

in the Civil Service Superannuation Acts, according to which gratuities may be awarded in consequence of disadvantages they may have sustained. But that is a matter of minor importance and minute detail upon which I will not at present detain the committee.

I come now to the arrangements I shall have to make with regard to private endowments—and here it would be as well to refer to a misunderstanding that sprung up in the course of last session in consequence of an expression used by me. I said in the course of discussion on the Irish Church that not less than three-fifths, as far as I could reckon, of the whole money value of the property of the Church would be given back to the Church itself or to its members in any form of disestablishment that Parliament would probably agree to. It was not generally observed how important a part of that statement were the words "or its members," which I pronounced with some emphasis. What the Church will receive under the plan of the Government I will endeavour to separate from what its members will receive. No doubt its members will receive compensation, and the congregations of the Church have a very real interest, if not a vested interest, in those compensations. But with regard to the Church itself, the proposal of the Government would be to convey to it nothing in the shape of what I may call marketable property—I will by-and-by explain what I mean by that phrase—with the exception of private endowments which it may have received.

I beg the committee not to come prematurely to a conclusion as to the meaning of those words, but I think I shall be able to make them good, and to explain them in the course of what I am now going to say. With respect to these private endowments we do not propose that the enactments relating to them should embrace churches or glebe houses, because these are dealt with on grounds of their own, which take them out of this category. But there are private endowments in the Irish Church, and although they do not appear to be very large in amount they are various in form—such as endowments in glebe lands, in tithes, and in money. And the definition of private endowments we think it fair to take is this: In the first place, it must be money which has been contributed from private sources. It may have been given in a public character, as for example in the case of Primate Boulter and Primate Robinson; but though given by persons holding a public position, its having been given in a private capacity evidently constitutes it a private endowment. But we limit it by date, and the date we have chosen to propose to Parliament for limitation is the year 1660—the year of the Restoration.

The reason that has recommended the date to us is the fact that the Restoration was really the period at which the Church of Ireland—the Reformed or Protestant Church of Ireland—assumed its present legislative shape and character. Before the wars of Charles I., in all the three Churches of the three kingdoms there were more or less the different elements that finally developed themselves into different forms of Protestantism, and these were in conflict together within the bosom of the National Church. In England we had Puritanism and Anglicanism struggling for ascendency within the pale of the Church, as we are told in Scripture that Jacob and Esau struggled together within the womb of their mother. In Scotland there was the same struggle, with the exception that there Presbyterianism was really in the ascendency. In Ireland Presbyterianism and Episcopacy were struggling powerfully together during the reigns of James I. and Charles I. It may not be known to all who hear me—though it ought to be known, and it tends strongly to justify us in not going beyond the Restoration—that the very confession, the doctrinal confession of the Irish Church in the reigns of James I. and Charles I. was not the same as that in England. It was modelled by Archbishop Usher upon the highest Calvinistic frame, and it included nine articles which composed a document well known in England under the name of the Lambeth Articles, drawn up in the latter end of the sixteenth century. I hope I shall not wound the feelings of any man when I say that it was one of the most formidable collections of theology which ever proceeded from the pen of a divine in the whole history of Christendom. It was different in spirit to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, and the constitution of the Irish Church was practically different. Presbyterianism was not formally or legally recognised, but it had a real or practical recognition in Ulster, which was occupied by Scotch rather than English colonists, who were for the most part Presbyterians. I find no proof that when a Presbyterian minister went over from Scotland to Ireland he was obliged to submit to reordination, and if a bishop had to go into a place where ordination was going on, he was never allowed, as far as I can learn, in the case of a man of strong Presbyterian opinions, to assert his Episcopal character and his exclusive power of ordination, but had to beg for admission into the room where the ordination was going on. Even if we could trace the private endowments back to so remote a period, the first effect would be to raise a strong controversy between the friends of Presbytery and Episcopacy.

When we come to the time of Charles II., at which period the ecclesiastical condition both of England and Ireland became distinct, we ask you, then, to distinguish private and public endowments, because we know historically that a man, at any rate, knew what he was doing, and the fair presumption arises that if he gave his money to the Church, it was for the support of that form of religion to which it is now

applied. That will be the definition we propose to take with respect to private endowments. They are not numerous in the Church of Ireland, but they are of extraordinary interest. Take the case of the parish of Laracor, the parish of which Swift was vicar before he was transferred to the deanery of St Patrick's. When he went into it, Laracor had a glebe house and one acre. He left it with a glebe house and twenty acres. He improved and decorated it in many ways. It is sad and melancholy to learn, if only we look upon this place as one of the memorials of so extraordinary a man, that many of the embellishments, or what our Scotch friends would call "amenities" of the glebe which grew up under his fostering hand have since been effaced. He endowed the vicarage with certain tithes which he had purchased for the purpose; and I doubt whether it is generally very well known that a curious question arises on this bequest, because a portion of his property—by-the-by, consisting, I believe, of those very tithes—was left by him for what he calls—I never knew the term to be used elsewhere—"the Episcopal religion established in Ireland." But that extraordinary man, even at the time when he wrote that the Irish Catholics were so down-trodden and insignificant that no possible change could ever bring them into a position of importance, appears to have foreseen the day when the ecclesiastical arrangements of Ireland would be called to account; because, not satisfied with leaving the property to maintain the Episcopal religion he proceeds to provide for the day when that Episcopal religion might be disestablished, and be no longer the national religion of the country. Apparently by some secret intimation he foresaw the shortness of its existence as an Establishment, for he left the property subject to a condition that in such case it should be administered for the benefit of the poor.

The value of the private endowments, as far as we have been able to ascertain, is not more than half-a-million, between land-tithes and money. It is very uncertain. I may say here that I think the committee will recognise the fairness of a step which we propose to take. There may be a good deal of legal research and legal expenditure requisite in order to obtain evidence upon those titles. We propose, therefore, to authorise the commissioners to allow the parties reasonable expenses in cases where they think those expenses have been fairly undertaken in ascertaining the title and establishing the fact of private endowments. I now come to the churches. This is the way in which we propose to deal with churches. When I say churches, I mean principally—indeed, I may say exclusively—churches which are in use by the present Established Church. Now, it is quite evident that churches cost a great deal of money to erect, but that when erected they do not properly fall within the category of "marketable property." Buyers will not easily be found, and in Ireland, as far as I can understand, there is no great insufficiency of churches—in the Establishment there is a profusion—among the Presbyterians or the Roman Catholics. Be that as it may—whether founded on feeling or the inconvertibility of churches into marketable property—we have no doubt whatever that, subject always to the general though not legal obligation of applying them to religious purposes, we propose that the churches of Ireland should be handed over to the governing body of the disestablished Church with as little difficulty, impediment, or embarrassment as possible.

What we propose, therefore, is, that within the trust those churches may be taken on the simple declaration of that body that it is their intention to take and maintain them for the purposes of worship, or else to take them down, which they wish to do in certain cases, where it is expedient for the purpose of substituting for them new churches, which the governing body may desire to build, and which may be more convenient, especially having reference to the altered temporal circumstances of their community. Under these circumstances, I have no doubt a great number of these churches will be taken over by the governing body of the disestablished Church; but, whether that be so or not, it is our duty to make provision for the accidental case of churches being refused. If churches be not taken over by the governing body, we are not led to think that it would be expedient for Parliament to contemplate their actual transfer, under operation of law, to any other religious community; nor are we led to believe that would be generally desired by any other party. We, therefore, take a general power to enable the commissioners to dispose of the site, or of the building itself, or, more properly, its materials.

Now, there is a case on which I should say a few words, because I think it is one in which equity requires or recommends that we should make a small allowance from the ecclesiastical fund to the disestablished Church. Unhappily, in Ireland there are not copiously scattered, as in England, churches which are beautiful and wonderful specimens of art, and which form one of the richest portions of our national treasury; but here and there in Ireland there are churches of that class. I need only mention one which has been before the public in a peculiar manner of late years—the Church of St Patrick in Dublin. We cannot but admit these two propositions: In the first place, that it is desirable that such churches should be maintained, that it would not be desirable for the credit or character of the country that they should fall into decay; and the second proposition is that the maintenance of such fabrics is more than we have a right to expect by means of casual vol-

untary contributions. If such a congregation, founded on voluntary bases, should think to erect for itself such a church as St Patrick's or Westminster Abbey, it will be for them to be responsible for its maintenance; but, with respect to those fabrics which have been erected and have been held under the expectation of permanent maintenance, we propose—subject to very careful limitations, for we confine the number to twelve churches—that the commissioners should be authorised, where it is desirable that a church should be maintained as a national monument, and where it is found that the maintenance would be too heavy for a voluntary congregation, to allow a moderate sum for its maintenance to those to whom it is given up. This is not a very large provision, but it is one recommended by the distinct equity of the case.

I will say one word with regard to churches which are not in use in Ireland. Some of these national monuments are of a curious and interesting character; but, at the same time, as in the case of the churches at Glendalough, they are not suited or adapted to public worship. Therefore, we propose that such churches should be handed over to the Board of Works, with an allocation of funds sufficient for their due and becoming preservation. In other cases where there are remains of churches and sites of churches, they might form burial-grounds, or be taken up and restored by one of the religious communities of the country. Though their value may be insignificant, we ask Parliament to give power to the commissioners to dispose of them to those communities.

The next question, I am sorry to say, like that of the curates, is beset with complications. It is one which was before the public last year, and with respect to it my views are very much qualified, or, indeed, I may say almost overturned, by the state of facts that since then we have become more accurately acquainted with. It is the case of the glebe houses; and I wish when I speak of them to include the see houses, as I included the bishops when I spoke of the incumbents, because, in all essential respects, they stand on the same footing. With respect to the glebe houses, it is exceedingly difficult to analyse the sources from which the means of building them have proceeded. Parliamentary grants have had a share of it, and private endowments have had a share of it; but the greater part of those funds has hitherto been supplied by charges deducted from the incomes of the clergy under Acts of Parliament, enabling them to charge their successors as well as themselves. Now, a nice and knotty question arises, as to whether money so obtained is to be regarded as a public or a private endowment. I can imagine a whole night spent in the discussion of that point. The greatest difficulties have arisen upon this point, and I myself have inclined sometimes one way and sometimes another with reference to it. As, in the case of the churches, there are some men of a practical turn of mind, not perhaps open much on the side of their imagination, whose minds were materially influenced by the observation that churches were not a marketable property, so the same feeling obtains as a general rule with respect to glebe houses, the value of which, while immense to the body that may possess the churches, is very small indeed to any other persons.

How correct I am in making this statement the committee will be enabled to judge when I inform them that we can trace an expenditure upon the glebe houses, not including sites, amounting to £1,200,000, and yet the whole of the present value of them in Ireland, including the ground upon which they are built, is estimated at only £18,600 per annum. [Murmurs from below the gangway on the ministerial side.] I hear a good deal of murmuring from some quarters of the House, and I am not surprised at it, because when these facts first came to my knowledge I was astonished myself. [An hon. member inquired whether the sum mentioned included the value of the glebes.] No, if I wanted to confuse the matter thoroughly I should merely have to discuss the subjects of the glebe houses and the glebes together. I have alluded to this point because I desire to draw a distinction between the title of the Church to what may be looked upon as property, because it can be converted into a sensible amount of money, and its title to that which, however valuable to it as a body, has no marketable value.

However, I by no means wish to be understood as saying that the glebe houses of Ireland are worth nothing. On the contrary, I will prove to the House that they are not worth nothing, and I will do so by showing that we shall not get hold of them without paying for them, as, unfortunately, they are saddled with heavy building charges. It is a singular fact that upon these glebe houses, which are valued at the present moment at £18,600 per annum—perhaps you may be justified in adding 20 per cent. to that amount in order to bring the value to the rack rental—there should be in addition to the enormous sums already laid out upon them a building charge outstanding of about £250,000. That is the exact state of the case, and I cannot put it too pointedly to the committee. £1,200,000 has been already laid out upon this property, of which the annual value, according to the tenements valuation, amounts to £18,600, and a further sum of £250,000 is still payable upon it on account of a building charge—a sum which must be paid in order to enable us to come into legal possession of it. Now, that is not certainly a very inviting prospect. I confess I was greatly astonished when I found that property which last year I proposed to treat as convertible property of very consid

erable value turned out to have this large charge upon it and to be of such comparatively small marketable value. However, such as it is, we of course propose to take it.

If the statement I have made prove to be inaccurate, and should it turn out that the glebe houses are of more value than I am now stating them to be, what I am now about to say will be subject, of course, to reconsideration. Assuming, however, that my information is correct with reference to the value of this property, then it appears to me that the best course we can adopt under the circumstances is this. This building charge, which will have to be paid by us in the first instance, is not uniformly distributed over the whole of the glebe houses. It is probable that in some cases it will amount to almost their full marketable value, while in others no building charge at all will have to be paid. The necessity of paying the building charge where it exists is binding upon us, because in such a case the incumbent would have been entitled to recover it from his successor, and consequently when the incumbent dies or commutes under the provisions of this bill, either he or his family will be entitled to recover it from us as standing in the place of his successor. We are, therefore, bound by law and by justice to discharge this obligation, and we are not called upon to exercise any discretion in the matter. We shall come into possession of the glebe houses when the existing life interests are exhausted, because our interest will still be only in the nature of a reversionary interest in the property, and then we shall have to pay the amount of the building charge still outstanding at the time.

Having come into possession of the property upon those terms, we shall assume that the glebe house, where fully charged, is no property at all, but we shall still regard the land upon which it stands as valuable property. We shall say to the Church body: "You have taken the church, and you may now negotiate with us for the land upon which the glebe house is built, and also for a small glebe not exceeding ten acres in extent of adjacent land, which we will sell you at a fair valuation." But we shall add: "Where you take the land you may take the house; but you must reimburse us the whole of the building charge we have paid upon it, subject to the limitation that it shall not exceed ten years' valuation." After a great deal of consideration, and after finding that the treasure we believed we possessed in the glebe houses was merely visionary, we have come to the conclusion that this is the best plan we can adopt in dealing with this description of property. It has been said that facilities ought to be given, although not in the way of grants to the members of other communions, for the purpose of enabling them to erect glebe houses for themselves. Now, that is a principle which has been already adopted by Parliament in the case of the Act of William IV., under which public money was advanced—under somewhat onerous conditions, it is true—to the Roman Catholics and the Presbyterians of Ireland for the purpose of building glebe houses. Although we have not inserted any clause to carry out such a proposal in the present bill, we think it may be desirable that loans for this purpose may be granted upon easy terms contemporaneously with the winding-up arrangements to be conducted by the Ecclesiastical Commission. At the same time it will be necessary to limit the operation of that system within a certain period of time, because I think it is open to considerable doubt whether it would be desirable to keep a law of that kind permanently upon the statute-book, seeing that it might possibly lead to some controversy in Ireland.

The question relating to the burial-grounds may be disposed of very shortly. I propose that the burial-grounds belonging to a church shall pass along with it to the Church body holding the latter, provision however being made in all cases for the preservation of existing interests in the burial-ground. It is known to the committee that the law in Ireland, as recently adjusted with respect to burying-grounds, is very different from, and is much more favourable to the public, than that in force in England. We propose that all other burial-grounds shall be given over to the guardians of the poor, and we propose to give uniformity and simplicity to the provisions of the law which is now in partial action.

I think I have now done with the winding-up arrangements of the bill as far as the Established Church is concerned. There still remains a portion of them which, although not very extensive in amount, is yet of very great importance, and one which, I am bound to add, is by no means free in all its bearing from difficulty. It was at all times part of the views of those who proposed the resolutions of last year that with the disestablishment of the Church must come the final cessation of all relations between the State and the Presbyterian clergy in Ireland and between the State and the College of Maynooth. I have now to consider in what manner effect is to be given to that conviction, which was strongly entertained by the House, and which was, in fact, embodied in a fourth resolution passed by the House during the session of 1868, which was added to the other three resolutions which had been previously agreed to. The sum which we have now to deal with is an annual sum of about £70,000. Of that amount £26,000 a year constitutes the vote for Maynooth, and between £45,000 and £50,000 is the aggregate of the votes given for the various communities of Presbyterians. We are no longer dealing with a simple and single body known to the law as the Established Church, but we are dealing with

classes which, in point of religious opinion, fall under a threefold division.

The interest now before us is that of the Old or Scotch Presbyterians, as I may call them for distinction's sake; the next is that of the minor bodies of Presbyterians, who are separated in Ireland from the main body, not only by religious communion, but by grave differences in those matters which lie at the foundations of the Christian faith. There are three or four of these bodies, such as the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, the Presbytery of Antrim, and one or two more, who fall under a different class of religionists; these, or some of them, entertaining Arian or what are called Unitarian opinions.

Then there are the Roman Catholics, sufficiently known to us to dispense with the necessity for any description as regards their religious opinions. If I refer to these distinctions of religious belief it is only for the purpose of stating in the broadest manner that on the part of her Majesty's Government I entirely decline on the present occasion to enter into such matters. I will not for one moment ask what are the political or the religious peculiarities of these bodies, professing the Christian name, with whom we are to deal; but I will endeavour to deal with them strictly, impartially, and equitably on the principles of civil justice, which apply to them all alike, and which render it iniquitous and wrong to raise controversial questions in regard to them or to matters of religious belief. The ground they stand on is that of citizenship—the claim they urge is that of general equity and good faith. We, the Government, have recognised that claim. I am confident that Parliament will recognise that claim in the case of the Established Church. Let us endeavour to proceed upon the same fair, and just, and liberal, though moderate, and prudent recognition of it in the case of these bodies exterior to the Established Church. Now, as respects the larger part of this sum of £70,000 a year, there is no difficulty—when you come to look at it in the light of a purely civil interest. Most of it is given in the shape of a direct vote of so much money passing immediately from the State to the individual through the synod, but in all cases the nature of the vested interest and expectancy—call it what you like—is the same. All we have to do is to take precisely the same course as with respect to the clergy of the Established Church. Take the question of income—which here being a mere matter of money can be at once ascertained—that is not given to him for nothing, but on the condition of the performance of duty. Hence, with a slight modification, which I need not here mention, a similar claim will arise in the case of the Presbyterian minister to that which I have already explained in the case of the incumbent; and the bill also will give to him a power of commutation in every substantial respect corresponding with that proposed to be made for the clergy of the Established Church.

So far with respect to the clergy and to life interests proper. Beside the ministers who perform spiritual offices in particular congregations, there is another class that appears to us to have a claim; they are what are called assistants and successors. Now these gentlemen are in a condition, not indeed as to the abundance of the interest at which they are ultimately to arrive, but otherwise I take it legally in a condition not very far removed from that of an heir of entail; they are already appointed to the assistant pastorship of a particular congregation; they derive no benefit from the *Regium Donum*, but the office of assistant which they hold entitles them to succeed after the death or resignation of the incumbent, and consequently it is urged that they have a just claim to the expectancy created by that right of succession. This is not a very large matter; it consists only of the difference in value between the life of the incumbent and the younger life of his successor; but to that extent we think it just that the claim should be provided for.

Then there is another class—the teachers of Presbyterian educational institutions under the general assembly of the Presbytery of Ulster. With regard to them, though they are not ministers, but professors only, we propose to deal with them precisely in the same manner as if they were pastors of churches, and to assure to them their salaries, together with a like power of commutation. But now comes a greater difficulty, with respect to those educational establishments to which I wish to call the attention of the committee for a few moments. When we disestablish a Church, and when a particular congregation ceases to have a pastor found for it by public funds, it feels an immediate want, and a stimulus is applied to it to satisfy that want. But when you deal with an establishment for educational purposes, a rather different order of considerations comes into play. There are several points which ought to be taken into account, although I will not say precisely what amount of weight is to be given to them.

In dealing with these Presbyterian places of education we have information upon which to proceed, but in dealing with the professors of the College of Maynooth we know nothing as to the details of the arrangements made with them. We have chosen to constitute a trust by the authority of an Act of Parliament, and to that trust we have committed the disposal of the grant which Parliament has thought fit to make. Well, now, what is the experience of England? The experience, in particular, of the training colleges proves that there should be some consideration in dealing with establish-

ments for education. I ought not, perhaps, to bring into the present discussion the case of Trinity College, Dublin, for her Majesty's Government make no proposal upon that subject at the present time. But it is perfectly plain that if the House and the legislature should adopt the measure that we now submit to it, Trinity College, Dublin, will have to be made the subject of legislation. It is also, I think, quite plain that it will be impossible to maintain the present exclusive application of the revenues of Trinity College to the purposes of a governing body and staff wholly connected with one religious persuasion. It is quite possible that Parliament may apply to Trinity College the same lenient method of dealing which it commonly adopts, and may think fit to leave some moderate provision applicable to the rearing, or to the teaching, at least, of the clergy, who will, as a clergy, become dependent entirely upon the resources of a voluntary communion. But undoubtedly when we come to deal with Trinity College we shall feel the force of this argument, that to put a sharp termination to the career of an educational establishment is a more trenchant operation than to do the same with the machinery for providing a parochial ministry, because one is a much stronger stimulus to persons to provide themselves with clergymen than the other is to induce them to maintain schools in which these clergymen can be trained. These general considerations, at the same time, are considerations which I know must not be pushed beyond their proper limits.

I hope the House will think, when I come to the end of this long and wearisome statement, that whatever the Government have done, they have endeavoured to keep strict good faith. I believe that I have announced no proposal as yet to which that character will not be held to apply when it is compared with our former declarations; and I trust that my announcements will remain the same to the end of the chapter. I have now to consider in the light and spirit of our general arrangements, and, subject always to the full maintenance, in letter and in spirit, of that which we have heretofore declared, what appears to us the most equitable method of dealing with the *Regium Donum*, the grant to Maynooth, and all similar grants. The Presbyterians are interested in this matter in respect of the college which they have in Belfast, and likewise in respect of a similar institution which exists for the benefit of minor Presbyterian bodies; the Roman Catholics are interested in it through the College of Maynooth; but there are also several other payments made by Parliament which, on the whole, fall under very much the same class of considerations. There is the payment made by Parliament to what is called the Presbyterian Widows' Fund. Now, that, of course, exists for the purpose of supplying wants that are coming into operation from year to year, and it would be very hard to withdraw that widows' fund without notice. In the same way it would be hard to withdraw without notice the grants now made to Presbyterian educational establishments and to the College of Maynooth. There is another class of payments made by the Presbyterians to their synodical officers. They hold an office regarding which it is very difficult to define the degree to which it should be considered a vested interest. But when we look at the whole of these matters, and read them in the light of the declarations and proceedings of last year, we have adopted—first, the principle that now permanent endowment can be given to them out of the public resources properly so-called; and, secondly, the principle that no permanent endowment can be given to them out of the National Ecclesiastical Fund of Ireland. What we propose, and we think it a fair and equitable proposal, is, that, in order to give time for the free consideration of the arrangements and the construction of scales for the satisfaction of life interests, and for avoiding violent shocks and disappointments to those whose plans for life may already have been made upon the supposition of the continuance of arrangements which have so long existed, and which were solemnly made, there should be a valuation of the interest of all these grants—a life interest at a moderate scale, or at fourteen years' purchase, of the capital amount now annually voted. [Sir S. Northcote: "The annual amount?"] Yes, the annual amount. It is a life interest, and it is to be commuted as a life interest is commuted, upon the age of the individual. That age varies. In the case of Presbyterian ministers, as there is a large number of years, that amount is high. In the case of bishops and dignitaries it is somewhat lower. We take fourteen years as, on the whole, a fair amount of these different grants. We propose to treat them substantially as life interests, and the payment is to be analogous to that made on other life interests, and this to wind up and close all the relations between those bodies and persons and the State.

Well, now, sir, I am coming in sight of port. There are two or three points which will not take long, apart from the question of religion and matters of controversy, but which are of so much interest to gentlemen connected with Ireland and the land of Ireland, and which likewise have so innocent and beneficial a bearing on the land question of Ireland, that I must beg for a little more of the indulgence of the committee. First of all, I would proceed to explain what I fear some of my hearers will think ought to be placed in the category of financial puzzles. If they do not entirely follow me, I will ask them, without understanding me, to believe it, and I will undertake to make it good upon a future occasion. It relates to the important

subject of the tithe rent-charge of Ireland. I have already said that I attach great importance to the merging of the tithe rent-charge, and for that reason the commission will step into the possession of it immediately after the passing of the Act. Well, if there be here any hon. gentlemen possessed of land in Ireland—and there are many—they will not be very grateful to me for what I am going first to state. It is that we shall give to them unconditionally the tithe rent-charge at 22½ years' purchase. That is, of course, 22½ years' purchase, not of the old gross £100, but of the £75 a year. We make that offer because we think there may be landlords in Ireland who will be disposed at once to wind up the arrangement with us.

But if gentlemen will listen to me they will see that we have another alternative for those who may not be disposed to purchase the tithe rent-charge out and out in money down at 22½ years' purchase. It is this—We make to them a compulsory sale. I have not the least idea that any one will object to that. We convey the tithe rent-charge to them under the following conditions: We charge them in our books with £2250 for every net £100 a year of tithe rent-charge. That is to say, we sell them a tithe rent-charge at a rate to yield them 4½ per cent. We then credit them on the other side with a loan of equal amount. We provide that they shall pay off that loan by annual instalments, with interest. But the rate of interest to be charged on the instalment is 3½ per cent. The consequence of that is that a fund of 1 per cent. will remain as a sinking fund to absorb the principal. The purchaser of the tithe rent-charge in that form—except that he will get rid of the fluctuation, for we must give him a fixed amount—will not be called upon to make any addition whatever to his annual payment. He will be liable to that annual payment for forty-five years, and at the close of that term he will, under this arrangement, have the rent-charge, whatever it may be, for the residue of the time for nothing. That will be the financial effect of the arrangement, which, I think, will not be bad for the Irish landlord. I perceive by the buzz around me that this subject is not without some interest to a great many hon. members. I may here say that in dealing with this question I have ventured to lament the necessity under which Parliament has found itself on a former occasion of wasting the property of the Irish Church in order to prevent its being so great in its magnitude as too much to shock the public mind. We have not proceeded on that principle of wasting. We have not sought to work down the residue that will remain to be disposed of; but we have endeavoured to make the most economical arrangement for the interest of that fund of which the equity of the case admits. And the committee will the more readily give me credit for what I have to say on this subject when I add that while in this manner we shall give 22½ years' purchase for the tithe rent-charge of Ireland, the average rate at which that charge sells in the market is very little, if at all, more than 16 or 17 years' purchase. On the other hand, it is not a bad arrangement for the public, because it may be safely taken as a general rule that the public, in arrangements reaching over a long period of time, are perfectly safe in undertaking to lend at 3½ per cent.

There is another point which need not detain us more than a moment. It relates to what will be in the recollection of Irish gentlemen—but there are very few still here who were in the House at the period of the Irish Church Temporalities Act—as the Perpetuity Purchase Clauses. They were clauses of an arrangement somewhat doubtful for the interest of the national ecclesiastical property of Ireland. We feel that under this bill equity requires that the persons who are now possessed of a title to purchase under these clauses should not be suddenly deprived of that title. But we also feel it to be impossible, in a measure of disestablishment and disendowment, to keep those clauses permanently in existence, in consequence of the highly anomalous and inconvenient confusion of interests which they create. We therefore propose that the power to purchase, now in the hands of the tenant, shall remain in existence for three years from the 1st of January 1871, and if not made use of in that interval, it shall then finally lapse and determine.

Another question of great and universal interest arises here. The commissioners to be appointed under this bill, or some body which may succeed them, after the difficult and onerous part of the arrangement shall be disposed of, will, as I think, be the holders of a considerable amount of property. The question is in what investment shall that be held. The perpetuity purchase rents now in existence appear to form, as far as they go, a very eligible description of investment, because they have the certainty of landed income without the incidents of fluctuation, or any of those difficult administrative questions which attach to the character of the landlord. The committee will, however, agree with me that it is not desirable either that this commission which we now propose to appoint, or any State authority in its place, should continue permanently to hold the Church land which will necessarily come into its possession. Such a commission is not and cannot be permanently a good landlord, and it is far better that it should discharge itself as soon as may be of duties it cannot properly fulfil.

What we propose, then, is that in selling the proprietary rights of these estates, the power of pre-emption should be provided for the tenants, and, what is more—indeed, without this addition, I do not think I could claim for this

provision credit for anything more than good intentions—we further propose that in such sales three-fourths of the purchase-money may be left upon the security of the land, and that the charge so remaining shall be liquidated by instalments, upon the principle adopted in the Drainage Act, by which we make the whole repayable in twenty-two years. Now, the nature of this proposal the committee thoroughly comprehend, and I trust it will meet with their approval. It does not place the land in the market in an anomalous character; it does not make the State responsible for duties that it cannot fulfil, and the permanent retention of which is alien from its nature. And it will have the economical effect of materially improving the price that we shall get for the land, and by this means we shall try the experiment on a limited scale of breaking up properties in a manner which I believe to be perfectly safe, easy, and unexceptionable.

I will now, sir, give to the committee the financial result of these operations in a very few words. With respect to the income of the Irish Church I shall say little, for I have great difficulty in making out what it is. The Church Commission laboured assiduously between 1867 and the end of 1868, and they have reported as the result of their inquiries that the income of the Irish Church is £616,000 a year. I must say, with very great respect for their sixteen months of toil, that I humbly dissent from the conclusion at which the commission arrived. It seems to me that they placed the revenue too low. I find that one of the commissioners, Colonel Adair who is known to have taken an active part in their labours, has within the last fortnight published a statement in which he puts the income of the Irish Church as high as £839,000 a year. I do not place it quite so high as Colonel Adair, nor quite so low as the Irish Church Commission. I believe it to be about £700,000 a year.

So much for the income of the Irish Church. But what we have more to do with is the capital. I have taken the tithe rent-charge at the rate of purchase I propose, and I find that the tithe rent-charge will yield £9,000,000. I have taken the land of all kinds—Episcopal and chapter lands, those belonging to glebes, etc., and putting on them the fairest valuation that a very competent person by whom we are assisted in Dublin can make, I find that the whole undivided value of the lands and of the perpetuity rents, if sold, would be £250,000. Besides that, there is money of one kind or another in stocks and banks to the amount of £750,000. I have not attempted to value the fabrics of churches, nor the fabrics of the glebe houses, because after what I have stated of how they stand in the tenement valuation and the charge upon them, I consider it would be idle to include them in this statement as an item of any considerable amount. The result, without taking into account the glebe houses and churches, is that the whole value of the Church property in Ireland, reduced and cut down as it has been—first by the almost unbounded waste of life tenants, and second by the wisdom or unwisdom of well-intending parliaments—the remaining value is not less than £16,000,000—an amount more considerable than I had ventured to anticipate, when, with smaller means of information, I endeavoured to form an estimate of it last year.

I now come to a delicate part of the case, and here the figures must be considered as taken with rather a broad margin. Yet, on the whole, I think they will be found very near the mark, so far as the total is concerned. The life interests of incumbents of all kinds in the Church — bishops, dignitaries, and parochial clergy—will amount, I think, to say £4,900,000; and if that appears to any one a large sum he should recollect that when divided by the large number of persons—2000—among whom the whole has to be apportioned, it represents a very slender acknowledgment for the labours, expectations, and costly education of those gentlemen, and for the anxieties and honest and good service by which their respective situations have been attended. The compensation of the curates, deducted from that of the incumbents, will come to £800,000. The lay compensations are not inconsiderable. They will come to £900,000. Of that something over £300,000, it is supposed, will be the value of the advowsons; but it is very difficult in Ireland to obtain fixed, clear, and definite rules for estimating their value. The transfer of them in Ireland is comparatively rare, and they are subject to a variety of contingencies which very much impair the means of judgment. It is not a large matter. We put it at about £300,000.

The other lay compensations embrace a class of persons who do not much enter into the view, looking at this subject generally; but the largest part will be absorbed by the parish clerks and sextons in Ireland, of whom the bulk, I believe, like the incumbents, have freehold offices, and must be dealt with on the very same principle as the incumbents. Then there are the officers of cathedrals, of the ecclesiastical courts, and the functionaries connected with the present Ecclesiastical Commission. These will bring up the amount of the lay compensations to about £900,000. The charge of private endowments on the fund is about £500,000, and in that, I may say in passing, will not be included the result of a recent Act of Parliament passed by Sir Joseph Napier as to endowments of a particular class, which it is not necessary to bring into this bill. The building charges on the glebe houses represent £250,000. The sum necessary to clear off our engagements upon the moderate footing we propose with respect to the

Presbyterians and Maynooth will be £1,100,000; and of that sum I ought to say two-thirds will go to the Presbyterians, and no more than one-third to Maynooth. I must also supply two small claims I had omitted. The Presbyterians claim, and I think it is not an unreasonable claim, that as we admit an educational establishment to require a little more time for maintaining it on the old system, we should give them some consideration in the shape of money in respect of the buildings they have raised in Belfast to meet the Parliamentary grant, which we shall be prepared to concede, subject to the *maximum* of £15,000. The other is a claim, not made by the Roman Catholics, but it is our opinion it ought to be made spontaneously, and that, I think, will be the universal opinion of the House. When the Act of 1845 was passed it was known to be the intention that the buildings of Maynooth should be kept in repair at the public charge. The House of Commons modified its views shortly after. The college had no means of meeting the necessary expense except by borrowing, and they have gone in debt to the Board of Works to the extent of £20,000. I think we should feel that that debt incurred in past time on account of these repairs, and in consequence of a change of view on the part of Parliament, ought at once to be remitted. I estimate the expense of this commission during the ten years of its continuance at £200,000, and that makes my total charge against the property of the Church amount to £8,500,000. So that the property will be divided—for I confess I have some faith in the moderation of my estimate—into two nearly equal parts; or, to be quite safe, I may call it £16,000,000; and as the charges upon it will come to between £8,000,000 and £9,000,000, the sum at the disposal of Parliament will not be less than between £7,000,000 and £8,000,000.

I have now, sir, done with my first and second dates, but there is one financial item which, through infirmity of memory, I have omitted. The committee will naturally ask how we are to pay the heavy charge that may be entailed by the commutations, because if the commutations are made, and we have every desire they should be made immediately or as soon as possible after disestablishment, they will require, between Episcopalians and Presbyterians, from £6,000,000 to £7,000,000. My answer is that, fortunately, the banking resources of my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer are such, with respect to the deposits of the public, as to cause no serious difficulty on that part of the case; and, as a matter of prudence, we have taken power in the bill to fix the payment of commutation money in eight instalments extending over four years.

And now supposing that all the arrangements which I have so imperfectly detailed, and which the committee have listened to with so much patience—supposing that we have reached the moment when these arrangements are all completed—that is, so far completed that provision is made for all they can possibly require—I now come to the third date to which I pointed at the commencement, and I ask a question which will reawaken the flagging interest of the committee—how we are to dispose of the residue? I will first state the conditions which appear to me necessary to be combined in a good plan for the disposal of such a fund. The first two are already fixed, written, I may say, in letters of iron. It is written that the money is to be applied to Irish purposes; and it is written that it is to be applied to purposes not ecclesiastical—not for any Church, not for any clergy, not for any teaching of religion, and I hope the committee will see that in thus broadly stating what I conceive to be the obligations we have come under, I am showing a disposition not to shrink from the fulfilment of those obligations.

But there are other requisites that it is most important to combine in any plan for the application of this residue. In the first place I think there are feelings much to be respected in a large portion of the community—of those who say that the time has come when the application of this money must be dissociated from the teaching of religion, but who at the same time would desire that its future application should, if possible, bear upon it some of those legible marks of Christian character, which would be as it were a witness to its first origin and its long-continued use, being applied as nearly as circumstances admit in conformity with what is usually the *cyprès* doctrine of courts of equity Another condition of a good plan is that it must not drag us from one controversy into another. We must not make this great controversy the mere doorway to another set of conflicts and disputes, perhaps equally embarrassing. One condition of a good plan is that, the question being Irish and wholly Irish, the plan must be equal in its application to all parties, and, as far as may be, to the whole community in Ireland. One condition more I will mention, to which I attach the highest value: the plan must embody the final application of the money. The money must be so disposed as that the day may never come when any member on either side of the House should suggest, seeing that there was a sum of money to dispose of, some scheme for its application, which would lead us back into all the embarrassments from which we are now at length vigorously struggling to free ourselves.

I will mention some of the modes suggested for the application of the money. The division of the fund among Churches only was out of the question, because such a measure would be in conflict with the sentiments of the people, the opinions of this House, and the pledges which we have given and which must be redeemed. Its

application to education would not fall so directly under the same ban, but it might give rise to the suspicion in Ireland that it was an endeavour to get rid of the annual grant, and might launch us into the controversies connected with the system of national education in that country. It has been proposed by some that the fund should be applied to public works in Ireland.

Those who have followed the history of the great attempt we made at public works in Ireland in reference to the Shannon drainage, will admit that the prospect opened by such a proposal is not very inviting. In the first place, it is a project which would lead to jobbery, and in the next place it would set every part of Ireland at variance with every other part in the scramble to obtain the largest possible portion of the money. In the third place, do what you could to promote equality, the application of the money must be unequal, because more would be given to certain districts than to others; and if the money were applied in the way of loan, the arrangement would lead to great improvidence, because when one public work was ended the money would flow back and become again available, and it would be impossible to make the fund a permanent foundation for loans without encountering difficulties of an objectionable character. In the same way reasons may be adduced against the application of the fund to railways, and, besides, it is impossible for us to connect the question of Irish railways with the question of the Irish Church. I know the interest which exists for railways in Ireland; but I also know that it is a question of great difficulty and complexity; and it is our duty in laying before you a measure for which we claim the merit of finality to make some proposal obvious and clear in character, and which does not involve you in any difficult inquiries. It will be the duty of the Government to give a careful consideration to all proposals in regard to Irish railways, without connecting them with the present matter.

It has next been proposed that the money should be applied to the poor-rates. Such an application, it appears to me, would be a great mistake. I am not in the least inclined to deny that the land and the landlords of Ireland may derive some considerable benefit in the long run from any mode in which the money might be applied for the benefit of Ireland; but when a system of legal obligation has been there constituted to satisfy a primary want—an obligation recognised in all quarters as incumbent on the property of the country—I do not think it necessary that this fund should be applied in relief of that legal obligation on property. I think we should be guilty of a great breach of duty in so applying it. The people of Ireland are, generally speaking, Roman Catholics, and I am ashamed to think how exceedingly small a portion of public money has fallen to their share as Roman Catholics. The mass of the people of Ireland are, therefore, entitled to be made, as far as possible, the principal recipients in the applications of the fund. I will venture to read to the committee the preamble of the bill, which I hope will be in the hands of members to-morrow night. It says: "Whereas it is expedient that the union created by Act of Parliament between the Churches of England and Ireland, as by law established, should be dissolved, and that the Church of Ireland, as so separated, should cease to be established by law, and that after satisfying, so far as possible, upon principles of equality as between the several religious denominations in Ireland, all just and equitable claims, the property of the said Church of Ireland, or the proceeds thereof, should be held and applied for the advantage of the Irish people, but not for the maintenance of any Church or clergy or other ministry, nor for the teaching of religion; and it is further expedient that the said property, or the proceeds thereof, should be appropriated mainly to the relief of unavoidable calamity and suffering, yet so as not to cancel or impair the obligations now attached to property under the Act for the relief of the poor." It is the latter part of the passage which defines the application of the money. There is in every country a region of want and suffering lying between the independent part of the community, on the one hand, and the purely pauperised population on the other. For this region of want and suffering it is very hard to make adequate provision by the poor law, which is almost intended to be niggard in its operations, because, if it were made liberal and large, the risk would then be run of doing the greatest possible injury to the independent labourer struggling to maintain himself. The want and suffering I now speak of are partly relieved, not through the medium of the poor law, but through the medium of the county cess—a heavy and increasing tax—not divided, as in the case of the poor-rate, between owner and occupier, but paid only by the occupier. The burden of this tax is not limited, like the poor-rate, to occupations above £4 in value, but descends to the most miserable tenements, the holders of which are required to pay for a class of suffering which in every Christian country should be relieved by a large and liberal expenditure.

Take, first of all, the lunatic asylums. The care of lunatics is one of the great duties of the community, and in Ireland, though the provision for them has as yet by no means overtaken the whole country, the cost on this head is already from £120,000 to £140,000, and will ultimately rise to £200,000. This expenditure is defrayed by the county cess, collected from the class of occupiers I have described. The case of the deaf and dumb and of the blind is

the next melancholy topic I will refer to. The alleviation of the condition of the deaf, the dumb, and the blind, scarcely comes within the province of the poor law, because it is a very costly matter. You will keep a pauper in a workhouse, and keep him decently, in Ireland, for some £7 or £8 a year; but you will not keep these classes—you will not give to the deaf and dumb and the blind the most precious boon you can give them—that is, training and instruction—under, perhaps, £30 or £40 per head per year. It is no common act to train these people and to convey to them, through the beneficial channels that the Almighty has given us, the blessings of knowledge and the faculty of applying their bodily powers to their own support. This description of want and suffering is marked out by every feature that can recommend it for the application of any funds like these. There are those who say these funds should not be secularised. I respect the feelings of those who are against the secularisation of such funds; but I say that if we go back to the history of ecclesiastical property in Europe the suggested application is not to be condemned and denounced as secularisation. The property of the Church was divisible into four parts. One of these was consecrated to the use of the poor; and, of all the poor, the afflicted cases I have named make the strongest appeal to human compassion. At the same time, when I know the condition of the Irish peasant, when I see that the charge through the medium of the county cess is to be laid mainly upon him, in the first instance, and wholly upon him by the present machinery of the law, I hail the occasion this gives us of at once effecting a great improvement in relieving the Irish occupier, and especially the poor occupier, from an important portion of his burden, and of providing a more ample, a more uniform, and a better regulated source of income for the relief of the very sorest of human afflictions.

The general framework of this plan will be developed when the third of the days I have described is arrived at. It will be the duty of the commission to report to the Queen that provision is made for all the purposes contemplated in the Act, and it will be their duty also to report what is the amount of surplus revenue available for these ulterior purposes, the whole of which will be enumerated in the bill. I will not trouble the committee now by reading them. I will not say whether or not it might be necessary to resort to further legislation; but these sums would be administered, not under any system wholly new, but they would be administered upon principles and according to rules which are already in partial and imperfect operation in Ireland. We shall escape altogether the religious difficulty, because we only purpose to stand upon ground the firmness and solidity of which we have ascertained by experience, and to make these sums available for their destined application, probably in most cases through the medium, and in all cases under the control—and that we provide in the bill—of the Poor Law Commissioners for Ireland. I have mentioned lunatics first because the provision to be made for lunatics is the largest of all. Next to these in order is the making a satisfactory provision for the training and instruction of the deaf and dumb and the blind. I beg the committee to understand I am not now speaking of institutions in which the deaf, the dumb, and the blind, are to be mewed up for life, but simply of schools in which they may receive that kind of instruction that they are capable of receiving for their own benefit; then to go out again into the world and play their part, so far as Providence permits, as useful members of society. We believe that a good system in aid of the poor law may be provided for that class of persons at an expense of about £30,000 a year, and the ultimate expense of the provision for lunatics would be £185,000 a year. The provision for other forms of mental weakness besides that I have named—that is, for idiots and others—might cost about £20,000 a year.

There is a provision urgently needed in Ireland, and that is a supply of properly-trained nurses for the use of paupers and for the poor who are above the paupers. The Irish medical men are known for their skill, but they are scattered over the country much more thinly than in England. The unions are large, and the public medical officer cannot be in two places at once. I am sorry to be informed upon good authority that the injuries to health, and even to life, which result from the want of skilled nurses, especially for women in labour, are grievous. The Poor Law Guardians shrink from incurring the necessary expense, and make the requisite provision in very few cases; but for a sum of £15,000 nurses might be provided all over Ireland. Reformatories and industrial schools languish in Ireland; they receive parliamentary grants; but between parliamentary grants and private benevolence they are inadequately supported. We shall propose to the committee that they also be included as recipients of £10,000 of these funds.

There is another charge, and that is for county infirmaries, to which I must call the particular attention of Irish members. The infirmary system of Ireland is at present charged upon the county cess, and is a burden on the poorest occupiers of the land. It is very imperfect in two particulars. In the first place, it often happens that the infirmary of the county, though in the capital of the county, is not central; and, although it is supported by taxes levied from the whole county, it is really a benefit only to a very small portion of it. In the second place, the government of these

infirmaries is wholly antiquated and unsuitable, and needs to be reformed. The sum to be claimed by the county infirmaries, hospitals, etc., may be put down at £51,000 a year. The general financial result is that I have pointed to a fund of between seven and eight millions, and the charges which will be most likely to occur under these heads, and which may be assumed from time to time as we are provided with the means, amount to £311,000 a year.

With the provision of all these requirements I think we should be able to combine very great reforms; we shall be able to apply strict principles of economy and good administration to all these departments; we shall be able to re-divide Ireland into districts around county infirmaries, well managed and governed, and so disposed as greatly to increase facility of access to them. Lastly, I have to mention that to which I confess I attach very great value and importance. It should be known that the state of things I have pointed out with regard to the county cess has attracted the attention of Irish members, and the attention of a committee of this House, which has recommended that the county cess be put upon the same footing as the poor-rate, that the poorer occupiers be relieved, and that the payment be divided between the landlord and the tenant. We certainly shall be in a better condition for inviting the Irish landlord to accede to that change when we are able to offer, as we shall offer by this plan, a considerable diminution of the burdens of the county cess. This is, in general terms, the mode in which we propose to apply the residue, and I am certain I am justified in inviting the serious attention of the House to the plan, and in expressing my confident expectation and belief that the more it is examined, the more will members find, passing over the objections they may have to disestablishment and disendowment, that it is a good and solid plan, full of public advantage.

I believe I have now gone through the chief of the almost endless arrangements, and I have laid as well as I am able the plans of the Government before the committee. I will not venture to anticipate the judgment of the committee, but I trust the committee will be of opinion it is a plan at any rate loyal to the expectations we held out on a former occasion, and loyal to the people of England who believed our promises. I hope also the members of the committee may think that the best pains we could give have been applied in order to develop and mature the measure, and I say that with great submission to the judgment of gentlemen on this and on the other side of the House. It is a subject of legislation so exceedingly complex and varied that I have no doubt there must be errors, there must be omissions, and there may be many possible improvements; and we shall welcome from every side, quite irrespective of differences of opinion on the outlines of the measure, suggestions which, when those outlines are decided upon, may tend to secure a more beneficial application of these funds to the welfare of the people of Ireland. I trust, sir, that although its operation be stringent, and although we have not thought it either politic or allowable to attempt to diminish its stringency by making it incomplete, the spirit towards the Church of Ireland as a religious communion, in which this measure has been considered and prepared by my colleagues and myself, has not been a spirit of unkindness.

Perhaps at this time it would be too much to expect to obtain full credit for any declaration of that kind. We are undoubtedly asking an educated, highly respected, and generally pious and zealous body of clergymen to undergo a great transition; we are asking a powerful and intelligent minority of the laity in Ireland, in connection with the Established Church, to abate a great part of the exceptional privileges they have enjoyed; but I do not feel that in making this demand upon them we are seeking to inflict an injury. I do not believe they are exclusively or even mainly responsible for the errors of English policy towards Ireland; I am quite certain that in many vital respects they have suffered by it; I believe that the free air they will breathe under a system of equality and justice, giving scope for the development of their great energies, with all the powers of property and intelligence they will bring to bear, will make that Ireland which they love a country for them not less enviable and not less beloved in the future than it has been in the past. As respects the Church, I admit it is a case almost without exception. I do not know in what country so great a change, so great a transition has been proposed, and has been embodied in a legislative provision, by which the ministers of a religious communion that have enjoyed during so many ages the favoured position of an Established Church, will no longer remain in that position. I can well understand that to many among them such a change appears to be nothing less than ruin and destruction. From the height on which they now stand to the apparent abyss into which they think they will have to descend there is something that recalls the words used in "King Lear," when Edgar endeavours to persuade Gloucester that he has fallen—from the cliffs of Dover. He says:

> "Ten masts at each make not the altitude
> Which thou hast perpendicularly fallen;
> Thy life's a miracle."

And yet but a little after the old man rallies from his delusion, and finds that he has not fallen at all. And so I venture to trust that when, stripped of the fictitious and adventitious aid upon which we have too long taught the Irish Establishment to lean, it shall come to

place its trust in its own resources, in its own secret wisdom, in all that can draw forth the energies of its ministers and its members, and the high hopes and promises of the Gospel that it teaches, it will find that it has entered upon a new era of its existence, an era fraught with hope and promise. At any rate, I think the day has certainly come when an end has finally to be put to the union, not between the Church as a religious association, but between the Establishment and the State, which was commenced under circumstances little auspicious, and which has continued to bear fruits of unhappiness to Ireland, and of discredit and scandal to England.

Sir, there is more to say. This measure is in every sense a great measure—great in its principle, great in the multitude not merely of its technical but of its important weighty and interesting provisions. It is not a great measure only, but it is a testing measure. It is a measure which will show to one and all of us of what metal we are made. Upon us all it brings a great responsibility—first and foremost undoubtedly upon us who occupy this bench. We are deeply chargeable—we are deeply guilty, if we have either dishonestly, as some think, or if we have even prematurely or unwisely, challenged so gigantic an issue. I know well the punishments that are due to rashness in public men; and that ought to fall upon those men who with hands unequal to the task attempt to guide the chariot of the sun. But our responsibility, though heavy, is not exclusive. It passes on from us to every man who has to take part in the discussion and in the decision of this question. Every man who proceeds to the discussion is under the most solemn obligation to raise the level of his vision, and to expand its scope in proportion to the greatness of the object. The working of our constitutional Government itself is upon its trial, for I do not believe there ever was a time when the whole of the legislative machinery was set in motion under the conditions of peace and order and constitutional regularity, to deal with a question graver or more profound. And more especially is the credit and fame of this great assembly involved. This assembly, which has inherited from so many long ages accumulated honour from numberless triumphs of peaceful but courageous legislation, is now called upon to address itself to a task which would indeed have demanded all the best energies of the very best of your fathers and your ancestors. I believe it will prove to be worthy of the task. Should it fail, even the fame of the House of Commons will suffer no disparagement; should it succeed, even that fame, I venture to say, will receive no small nor insensible addition. I must not ask gentlemen opposite to concur in these few sentences, grateful as I am to them for the kindness with which they have heard the statement which I have made. But I beg and pray them to bear with me for a moment while, for myself and my colleagues, I say that we are sanguine of the issue. We believe this controversy is near its end, and, for my part, I am deeply convinced that, when the day of final consummation shall arise, and when the words are spoken that give the force of law to the work embodied in this measure—a work of peace and justice—those words will be echoed from every shore where the name of Ireland and the name of Great Britain have been heard; and the answer to them will come back in the approving verdict of civilised mankind.

PREACHING.

[Delivered March 22, 1877, at a conference on "Pew and Pulpit," held at the City Temple, London—Dr Joseph Parker presiding.]

DR PARKER AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—If I rise to say a few words on this interesting occasion, I assure you that my main purpose—perhaps it ought to be my only purpose—is to convey to your minds the great respect and sympathy which I feel for the aim of those meetings. We are here upon common ground. If there are differences among us, I am one of those who think that it is the business of any man of a manful character to sink those differences upon proper occasions only. Let him upon all occasions take care that they never become to him a cause of bitterness or evil speaking.

But we are here upon common ground with a great and mighty function belonging, from the first especially, almost exclusively, to revealed religion, a function the efficacy of which must undoubtedly depend in the main upon the matter which is preached. We are here as Christians—and you are fitter, I have no doubt, to impress that upon me—and it is the preaching of Christ our Lord which is the secret and substance and centre and heart of all preaching, not merely of facts about Him and notions about Him, but of His person, His word, His character, His simple yet unfathomable sayings here—His is the secret and art of preaching.

I am not here to touch upon those solemn portions of the subject, which are more fitly in the hands of others, as I understand the purpose you are proceeding upon is this conception, which I take to be a true one, that independently of its great and sacred aim, and of the matter to be taught, preaching is an art; and that in the careful consideration of that art lie many secondary, but not unimportant, means for the more complete and perfect attainment of the end. With these we are all familiar. We know that the word, not in its theoretical sense, but as the briefest mode of expressing the art of business and conversation—the word in man is a great instrument of power. As long as three thousand years ago, among those ancient

forefathers of the Greek nation from whom we have still in many things much to learn, and in whom we find a multitude of points of sympathy, it is most remarkable that the great orator, the great poet who has commemorated their deeds, and who lived in a time of turbulence and war, nevertheless places one other instrument of power upon a level with the sword, and that is the word proceeding from the mouth of man. Well, now this word has to be consecrated to aims most high and solemn, which were in great part hidden from the men of those days, but the more high and solemn the aim the greater ought to be the care that the means for attaining such an end are carefully considered and wisely employed. Now it is difficult on this occasion to avoid—yet I am unwilling to assume—the character of a critic, for it appears we have only the choice of criticising the preacher or criticising the hearer. But I cannot avoid expressing my strong concurrence in that which was said by your respected pastor, Dr Parker, and by Mr Sawyer. I think that, upon the whole, at least I speak of the religious body with which I am chiefly conversant, I think the pulpit gets somewhat less than justice from those who sit beneath it. Anyhow, that complaint of commonplaces is a complaint doubtless very often urged with truth, but sometimes urged without sufficient warranty or ustification.

Dr Parker has well told us that the most essential elements and constituents of life are in those commonplaces of life, and while he spoke I bethought myself, of which I take to be the truth, that the real reason in a large number of cases, though I by no means say in all, why the declarations from the pulpit are thought to be commonplaces is because there is some deficiency in that healthy appetite by which they ought to be received by the pew. He reminded me of an illustration which I think is apposite in one of the short but beautiful poems by Gray—and Gray never wrote anything that was not beautiful—in which he describes the case of an invalid whose recovered health just enables him to go forth from his home and return to the beginnings, at least, of common life:

> "The common air, the sun, the skies
> To him were opening Paradise."

What can be more common than the air, the sun, the skies? But to him they were "opening Paradise," not because they were anything more in themselves than they were for the multitudes who wander under them unheeding and ungrateful, but because by the stern lesson of his privations he had learned how precious they were; and returning energy and health made him know the high value of those blessings; and so I am convinced that, in proportion as that healthy appetite can be encouraged and stimulated, the range of these complaints of commonplaces will be greatly and materially narrowed. I deny not that there are cases in which it may apply, but here I will remind you of an old couplet of one of our sacred poets—I mean the excellent George Herbert:

> "The worst of preachers have something good; if all want sense,
> God takes a text and preacheth patience."

So much for the subject of commonplaces.

I will venture to say one word upon another, but it will be one word only, for it is too vast to be touched except incidentally, that is, the subject of the relation of the office of preaching to science. There are some who are connected with science who seem to think it is a part of their mission to put an end to preaching. My belief is, that as long as mankind subsists, that preaching and science will both have their places in the field of life; and if I were to wager, I would just as readily wager in favour of the longevity of preaching as I would on the longevity of science. I will venture to say as much as this, and I hope it will not be misunderstood. I quite comprehend that it is no part of the ordinary business of preaching to puzzle and disturb men's minds by wandering with questions which are for them, to a great extent, and in the majority of cases, abstract and speculative questions, lying outside the path of life instead of outside the path of duty in life. But when I ask myself why is it at this moment that the tone of so many professors of science is so harsh, so unkindly, and so domineering towards that precious gem and jewel, religion, which is the hope of human kind, I cannot but admit to myself that it is in part a reaction from a state of things, and that those who had believed in religion, and professed religion, and even taught religion, have in various ways been not sufficiently careful at all times to avoid placing stumbling-blocks in the way of their brethren by fictitious modes of representing divine truth by those accretions of opinion adhering to the body of the Gospel which, growing by a process of nature—which do not belong exclusively to the Roman Catholic Church, or to any Church in particular, which, by the process of nature, are ever in necessary growth, and which there is a tendency in us belonging to our habits, and which there is a tendency in us too much to treat, perhaps, as portions of the Gospel; and, on the contrary, they only, perhaps, tend to obscure, and even bar the way, in many enlightened minds. I am persuaded that it is a precept of great practical importance that not only the substance of the thing taught, but the manner of the thing taught, should be continuously studied, that the precept not to offend "one of these little ones" should be remembered in its application not merely to those who know themselves to be little ones, but to all who are

little ones in reference to divine truth and knowledge, even if they be rich in the cultivation and science that this world can give them.

One word upon a question which must be familiar to all who are conversant with this great question—the question of preparation—and here we come upon ground that is common to secular and to divine oratory. That we are all agreed in that there cannot be too much preparation, if it be of the right kind. No doubt it is the preparation of matter; it is the accumulation and thorough digestion of knowledge; it is the forgetfulness of personal and selfish motives; it is the careful consideration of method; it is that a man shall make himself as a man suited to speak to men rather than that he should make himself as a machine ready to deliver to man certain preconceived words. In that kind of preparation I hope we are continually advancing. As far as I can understand, in the nonconformist Churches as well as in the Church of England, a continually increasing attention is devoted to this subject. It is felt that he who takes upon himself this great and elevated function ought to be as a scribe "well instructed in the knowledge of God, and bringing forth out of His treasures things new and things old." With regard to this use of the preparation, as distinct from the methodical collection and delivery of words, there is plenty of authority all the world over. It is now nearly forty years—at any rate it is more than thirty years—since it fell to my lot to make the acquaintance of a man who has been often and favourably heard here for his uprightness and learning in this country during late years. I mean the celebrated Professor of Munich, Dr Dollinger. And he said to me: "Depend upon it if the Church of England is to make way and be a thoroughly national Church" (he did not speak of competition with nonconformists at all, but in its relation to the great bulk and body of the people), "they must give up the practice of preaching from written sermons." He told me this rather in regard to and as indicating a local usage at Munich. He said we have a principle among us that when there are difficulties in obtaining what I may call free preaching—unwritten sermons—by the ordinary machinery, he resorted to extraordinary machinery. The parishes of those places are all of them filled up by native priests—priests belonging to the district—but it so happens that they are not ready speakers, and, in consequence, the usage has been adopted, and it is now the regular rule that, while there is one of the natives who is the priest of the parish, and carries on its ordinary labours, there is invariably chosen a lecturer, who preaches to the people of the church. But do not let us suppose that because the principle is to be adopted there will be a smaller necessity for knowledge and cultivation on the part of those who are to preach. On the contrary, if they are to preach *extempore*, without knowledge, study, thought, and cultivation, as well as those high and more sanctifying means which every right-minded preacher will adopt, they will be as "sounding brass and tinkling cymbals," and no better. It is only out of the full heart, and likewise out of the well-furnished mind, that good extemporaneous preaching can proceed.

There was a little criticism made upon Dr Parker, to which, in answer, he showed a skill in fence and a power of repartee that gives me a very clear belief that being a good and efficacious preacher does not imply any deficiency in the art of self-defence. That leads me to this point of personal peculiarities of preachers. These personal peculiarities, no doubt, ought to be kept within bounds, but depend upon it they ought not to be altogether renounced. When you come to a really remarkable preacher, you will not find one of them who has not distinctive marks, just as you will never find one human face that is worth the wearing that has not got in some shape or other some distinctive marks. If I go back myself upon remarkable preachers whom I have heard, I have heard Dr Newman about forty years ago. Dr Newman was at that time, long ago, before the era of the controversies with which his name is connected; but, controversy or no controversy, battle or no battle, a man like Dr Newman, with his deep piety and his remarkable gifts of mind, could not but be a great object of interest. Dr Newman, when I was an undergraduate at Oxford, was looked upon rather with prejudice, and termed a Low Churchman, but very much respected for his character and his known ability. He was then the vicar of St Mary's, at Oxford, and used to preach there without ostentation or effort, but by simple excellence he was continually drawing undergraduates more and more around him. Now, Dr Newman's manner in the pulpit was one which, if you considered it in its separate parts, you would arrive at very unsatisfactory conclusions. There was not very much change in the inflection of the voice, action there was none, his sermons were read, and his eyes were always on his book, and all that, you will say, is against efficiency in preaching. Yes, but you take the man as a whole, and there was a stamp and a seal upon him, there was a solemn music and sweetness in the tone, there was a completeness in the figure, taken together with the tone and with the manner, which made even his delivery, such as I have described it, and though exclusively with written sermons, singularly attractive.

Well, now, I will make a great jump and go to another very notable and very admirable man—I mean Dr Chalmers. I have heard Dr Chalmers preach and lecture, and I think I have heard him speak. Well, now, I being a man of Scotch blood, I am very much attached to Scotland and

like even the Scotch accent, but not the Scotch accent of Dr Chalmers. Undoubtedly the accent of Dr Chalmers in preaching and delivery was a considerable impediment, notwithstanding that it was all overborne by the power of the man in preaching, overborne by his power, melted into harmony with all the adjuncts and incidents of the man as a whole, so much so that although I would have said the accent of Dr Chalmers was distasteful, yet in Dr Chalmers himself I would not have it altered in the smallest degree. This all sums up into the general principle—Let the preacher never forget the reality of the man, let him never become a conventional being, let him never adopt—what, you won't misunderstand me if I use a homely phrase—the mere slang of religion, for there is a slang in religion, that is to say, there is an illegitimate growth of vulgarity and dialect in religion as in everything else. Let him retain his reality as a man, and in proportion to the sense he entertains of the immeasurable dignity and power of the office he has to fill, and the instrument he has to wield. Let him extend a proportionate corresponding care in the cultivation, ay, of the very smallest incidental qualities that he thinks may contribute to the fuller accomplishment of his work.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY.

[From the conclusion of a speech in the House of Commons, in support of resolutions that Great Britain use her influence in order to secure local liberty and practical self-government in the Christian provinces of Turkey, and of the exacting, along with the other powers, of such changes in the government of Turkey as might be thought necessary in the interests of humanity and justice and other good ends, May 7, 1877.]

SIR,—There is before us not one controversy, but two. There is the controversy between Russia and Turkey; there is the controversy between Turkey and her revolted subjects. I think the Government and their supporters out of doors in the press are making a great error in this—that it is the first of these two controversies—that between Russia and Turkey, which, after all, is only symptomatic—to which they address their minds. In my opinion the other is the deeper and more important. The other is a controversy which can have no issue but one, and I do not hesitate to say that the cause of the revolted subjects of Turkey against their oppressors is as holy a cause as ever animated the breast or as ever stirred the heart of man. Sir, what part are we to play? Looking at this latter controversy—the controversy between Turkey and her subjects—the horrible massacres of last year, the proofs which have been afforded that they are only parts and indications of a system, that their recurrence is to be expected, and is a matter of moral certainty if they are now allowed to pass with impunity—looking at the total want of result from Lord Derby's efforts, at that mockery which has been cast in our teeth in return for what I quite admit was upon ordinary principles an insulting despatch, can we, sir, say with regard to this great battle of freedom against oppression which is now going on, which has been renewed from time to time, and for which one-third of the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina are at this moment not only suffering exile, but, terrible to say, absolute starvation, upon which depends the fate of millions of the subject races that inhabit the Turkish empire—can we with all this before us, be content with what I will call a vigorous array of remonstrances, well intended, I grant, but without result, as the policy of this great country? Can we, I say, looking upon that battle, lay our hands upon our hearts and, in the face of God and man, say with respect to it, "We have well and sufficiently performed our part?" Sir, there were other days when England was the hope of freedom. Wherever in the world a high aspiration was entertained or a noble blow was struck, it was to England that the eyes of the oppressed were always turned—to this favourite, this darling home of so much privilege and so much happiness, where the people that had built up a noble edifice for themselves would, it was well known, be ready to do what in them lay to secure the benefit of the same inestimable boon for others. You talk to me of the established tradition, in regard to Turkey. I appeal to the established tradition, older, wider, nobler far—a tradition not which disregards British interests, but which teaches you to seek the promotion of those interests in obeying the dictates of honour and of justice. And, sir, what is to be the end of this? Are we to identify the fantastic ideas some people entertain about this policy and that policy with British interests, and then fall down and worship them? Or are we to look, not at the sentiment, but at the hard facts of the case, which Lord Derby told us fifteen years ago—namely, that it is the populations of those countries that will ultimately possess them—that will ultimately determine their future condition? It is to this that we should look, and there is now before the world a glorious prize. A portion of those people are making an effort to retrieve what they have lost—I mean those in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Another portion—a band of heroes such as the world has rarely seen—stand on the rock of Montenegro, are ready now, as they have ever been during the four hundred years of their exile from their fertile plain, to meet the Turk at any odds for the re-establishment of justice and of peace in those countries. Another portion still, the five millions of Bulgarians cowed and beaten down to the ground, hardly venturing to look upwards, even to their Father in heaven, have

extended their hands to you, they have sent you their petition, they have prayed for your help and protection. They have told you that they do not want alliance with Russia or with any foreign power, but that they want to be delivered from an intolerable burden of woe and shame. That burden of woe and shame—the greatest that exists on God's earth—is one that we thought united Europe was about to remove, that in the Protocol united Europe was pledged to remove; but which for the present you seem to have no efficacious means of contributing to the removal of. But, sir, the removal of that load of woe and shame is a great and noble prize. It is a prize well worth competing for. It is not yet too late to try to win it. I believe there are men in the cabinet who would try to win it. It is not yet too late, I say, to become competitors for that prize; but be assured that whether you mean to claim for yourselves a part of the immortal crown of fame which will be the reward of true labour in that cause, or whether you turn your backs upon that cause and your own duty, I believe, for one, that the knell of Turkish tyranny in those provinces has sounded. It is about to be destroyed, perhaps not in the way or by the means that we should choose; but come the boon from what hands it may, I believe it will be gladly accepted by Christendom and by the world.

JOHN BRIGHT.

1811-1889.

THE CRIMEAN WAR.*

I AM one of those who belong to that small party which has been alluded to by the hon. member for Aylesbury who object to the policy by which this country has arrived at the "triumphant position which it now occupies." In coming forward to speak on this occasion, I may appear somewhat in the position of a physician proposing to prescribe to-day for a man who died yesterday, and be told that it is of no use to insist upon views which the Government and the House have already determined to reject. I feel, however, that we are entering upon a policy which may affect the fortunes of this country for a long time to come, and I am unwilling to lose this opportunity of explaining wherein I differ from the course which the Government has pursued, and of clearing myself from any portion of the responsibility which attaches to those who support the policy which the Government has adopted.

We are asked to give our confidence to the administration in voting the address to the Crown, which has been moved by the noble lord the member for London, and to pledge our support to them in the war in which the country is now to engage. The right hon. gentleman the member for Buckinghamshire [Mr Disraeli], on a recent occasion, made use of a term which differed considerably from what he said in a former debate; he spoke of this war as a "just and unnecessary war." I shall not discuss the justice of the war. It may be difficult to decide a point like this, seeing that every war undertaken since the days of Nimrod has been declared to be just by those in favour of it; but I may at least question whether any war that is unnecessary can be deemed to be just. I shall not discuss this question on the abstract principle of peace at any price, as it is termed, which is held by a small minority of persons in this country, founded on religious opinions which are not generally received, but I shall discuss it entirely on principles which are accepted by all the members of this House. I shall maintain that when we are deliberating on the question of war, and endeavouring to prove its justice or necessity, it becomes us to show that the interests of the country are clearly involved; that the objects for which the war is undertaken are probable, or, at least, possible of attainment; and, further, that the end proposed to be accomplished is worth the cost and the sacrifices which we are about to incur. I think these are fair principles on which to discuss the question, and I hope that when the noble lord the member for Tiverton [Lord Palmerston] rises during this debate, he will not assume that I have dealt with it on any other principles than these.

The House should bear in mind that at this moment we are in intimate alliance with a neighbouring Government, which was, at a recent period, the originator of the troubles which have arisen at Constantinople. I do not wish to blame the French Government, because nothing could have been more proper than the manner in which it has retired from the difficulty it had created; but it is nevertheless quite true that France, having made certain demands upon Turkey with regard to concessions to the Latin Church, backed by a threat of the appearance of a French fleet in the Dardanelles, which demands

* Delivered in the House of Commons, March 31, 1854.

Turkey had wholly or partially complied with; Russia, the powerful neighbour of Turkey, being on the watch, made certain other demands, having reference to the Greek Church; and Russia at the same time required (and this I understand to be the real ground of the quarrel) that Turkey should define by treaty, or convention, or by a simple note, or memorandum, what was conceded, and what were the rights of Russia, in order that the Government of Russia might not suffer in future from the varying policy and the vacillation of the Ottoman Government.

Now, it seems to me quite impossible to discuss this question without considering the actual condition of Turkey. The hon. member for Aylesbury assumes that they who do not agree in the policy he advocates are necessarily hostile to the Turks, and have no sympathy for Turkey. I repudiate such an assumption altogether. I can feel for a country like that, if it be insulted or oppressed by a powerful neighbour; but all that sympathy may exist without my being able to convince myself that it is the duty of this country to enter into the serious obligation of a war in defence of the rights of that country. The noble lord the member for Tiverton is one of the very few men in this House, or out of it, who are bold enough to insist upon it that there is a growing strength in the Turkish empire. There was a gentleman in this House, sixty years ago, who, in the debates in 1791, expressed the singular opinion which the noble lord now holds. There was a Mr Stanley in the House at that period, who insisted on the growing power of Turkey, and asserted that the Turks of that day "were more and more imitating our manners, and emerging from their inactivity and indolence; that improvements of every kind were being introduced among them, and that even printing-presses had been lately established in their capital." That was the opinion of a gentleman anxious to defend Turkey, and speaking in this House more than sixty years ago; we are now living sixty years later, and no one now, but the noble lord, seems to insist upon the fact of the great and growing power of the Turkish empire.

If any one thing is more apparent than another, on the face of all the documents furnished to the House by the Government of which the noble lord is a member, it is this, that the Turkish empire is falling, or has fallen, into a state of decay, and into anarchy so permanent as to have assumed a chronic character. The noble lord surely has not forgotten that Turkey has lost the Crimea and Bessarabia, and its control over the Danubian principalities; that the kingdom of Greece has been carved out of it; that it has lost its authority over Algiers, and has run great risk of being conquered by its own vassal the Pasha of Egypt; and from this he might have drawn the conclusion that the empire was gradually falling into decay, and that to pledge ourselves to effect its recovery and sustentation, is to undertake what no human power will be able to accomplish. I only ask the House to turn to the statements which will be found nearly at the end of the first of the blue books recently placed on the table of the House, and they will find that there is scarcely any calamity which can be described as afflicting any country, which is not there proved to be present, and actively at work, in almost every province of the Turkish empire. And the House should bear in mind, when reading these despatches from the English consuls in Turkey to the English ambassador at Constantinople, that they give a very faint picture of what really exists, because what are submitted to us are but extracts of more extended and important communications. It may fairly be assumed that the parts which are not published are those which described the state of things to be so bad that the Government has been unwilling to lay before the House, and the country, and the world, that which would be so offensive and so injurious to its ally the Sultan of Turkey.

But, if other evidence be wanting, is it not a fact that Constantinople is the seat of intrigues and factions to a degree not known in any other country or capital in the world? France demands one thing, Russia another, England a third, and Austria something else. For many years past our ambassador at Constantinople has been partly carrying on the government of that country, and influencing its policy, and it is the city in which are fought the diplomatic contests of the great powers of Europe. And if I have accurately described the state of Turkey, what is the position of Russia? It is a powerful country, under a strong executive government; it is adjacent to a weak and failing nation; it has in its history the evidences of a succession of triumphs over Turkey; it has religious affinities with a majority of the population of European Turkey which make it absolutely impossible that its Government should not, more or less, interfere, or have a strong interest, in the internal policy of the Ottoman empire. Now, if we were Russian—and I put the case to the members of this House—it is not likely, according to all the theories I have heard explained when we have been concerned in similar cases, that a large majority of the House and the country would be strongly in favour of such intervention as Russia has attempted? and if I opposed it, as I certainly should oppose it, I should be in a minority on that question more insignificant than that in which I have now the misfortune to find myself with regard to the policy of the Government on the grave question now before us.

The noble lord the member for London has made a statement of the case of the Government, and in favour of this address to the Crown; but I thought it was a statement remarkably feeble in fact and in argument, if intended as a justifi-

cation of the course he and his colleagues have taken. For the purposes of the noble lord's defence, the Russian demand upon Turkey is assumed to be something of far greater importance than I have been able to discover it to be from a careful examination of the terms in which it was couched. The noble lord himself, in one of his despatches, admits that Russia had reason to complain, and that she has certain rights and duties by treaty, and by tradition, with regard to the protection of the Christians in Turkey. Russia asserted these rights, and wished to have them defined in a particular form; and it was on the question of the form of the demand, and the manner in which it should be conceded, that the whole of this unfortunate difference has arisen. Now, if Russia made certain demands on Turkey, this country insisted that Turkey should not consent to them; for although the noble lord has attempted to show that Turkey herself, acting for herself, had resolved to resist, I defy any one to read the despatches of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe without coming to the conclusion that, from the beginning to the end of the negotiations, the English ambassador had insisted, in the strongest manner, that Turkey should refuse to make the slightest concession on the real point at issue in the demands of the Russian Government. As a proof of that statement, I may refer to the account given by Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, in his despatch of the 5th of May 1853, of the private interview he had with the sultan, the minister of the sultan having left him at the door, that the interview might be strictly private. In describing that interview, Lord Stratford says, "I then endeavoured to give him a just idea of the degree of danger to which his empire was exposed." The sultan was not sufficiently aware of his danger, and the English ambassador "endeavoured to give him a just idea of it;" and it was by means such as this that he urged upon the Turkish Government the necessity of resistance to any of the demands of Russia, promising the armed assistance of England, whatever consequences might ensue. From the moment that promise was made, or from the moment it was sanctioned by the cabinet at home, war was all but inevitable; they had entered into a partnership with the Turkish Government (which, indeed, could scarcely be called a Government at all), to assist it by military force; and Turkey, having old quarrels to settle with Russia, and old wrongs to avenge, was not slow to plunge into the war, having secured the co-operation of two powerful nations, England and France, in her quarrel.

Now, I have no special sympathy with Russia, and I refuse to discuss or to decide this question on grounds of sympathy with Russia or with Turkey; I consider it simply as it affects the duties and the interests of my own country. I find that after the first proposition for a treaty had been made by Prince Menchikoff, that envoy made some concession, and asked only for a *Sened*, or convention; and when that was disapproved of, he offered to accept a note, or memorandum merely, that should specify what should be agreed upon. But the Turk was advised to resist, first the treaty, then the convention, and then the note or memorandum; and an armed force was promised on behalf of this country. At the same time he knew that he would incur the high displeasure of England and France, and especially of England, if he made the slightest concession to Russia. It was about the middle of May that Prince Menchikoff left Constantinople, not having succeeded in obtaining any concession from the Porte; and it was on the 3d of July that the Russian forces crossed the Pruth; thinking, I believe, by making a dash at the principalities, to coerce Turkey, and deter her allies from rendering her the promised support. It has been assumed by some, that if England had declared war last year, Russia would have been deterred from any further step, and that the whole matter would have been settled at once. I, however, have no belief that Russia on the one hand, or England and France on the other, would have been bullied into any change of policy by means of that kind.

I come now to the celebrated "Vienna note." I am bound here to say that nobody has yet been able clearly to explain the difference between the various notes Turkey has been advised to reject, and this and other notes she has been urged to accept. With respect to this particular note, nobody seems to have understood it. There were four ambassadors at Vienna, representing England, France, Austria, and Prussia; and these four gentlemen drew up the Vienna note, and recommended it to the Porte as one which she might accept without injury to her independence or her honour. Louis Napoleon is a man knowing the use of language, and able to comprehend the meaning of a document of this nature, and his minister of foreign affairs is a man of eminent ability; and Louis Napoleon and his minister agree with the ambassadors at Vienna as to the character of the Vienna note. We have a cabinet composed of men of great individual capacity; a cabinet, too, including no less than five gentlemen who have filled the office of Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and who may, therefore, be presumed to understand even the sometimes concealed meaning of diplomatic phraseology. These five Foreign Secretaries, backed by the whole cabinet, concurred with the ambassadors at Vienna, and with the Emperor of the French and his Foreign Secretary, in recommending the Vienna note to the sultan as a document which he might accept consistently with his honour, and with that integrity and that independence which our Government is so anxious to secure for him. What was done with this note? Passing by the mar-

vellous stupidity, or something worse, which caused that note not to be submitted to Turkey before it was sent to St Petersburg, he would merely state that it was sent to St Petersburg, and was accepted in its integrity by the Emperor of Russia in the most frank and unreserved manner. We were then told—I was told by members of the Government—that the moment the note was accepted by Russia we might consider the affair to be settled, and that the dispute would never be heard of again. When, however, the note was sent to Constantinople, after its acceptance by Russia, Turkey discovered, or thought, or said she discovered, that it was as bad as the original or modified proposition of Prince Menchikoff, and she refused the note as it was, and proposed certain modifications. And what are we to think of these arbitrators or mediators—the four ambassadors at Vienna, and the Governments of France and England—who, after discussing the matter in three different cities, and at three distinct and different periods, and after agreeing that the proposition was one which Turkey could assent to without detriment to her honour and independence, immediately afterwards turned round and declared that the note was one which Turkey could not be asked to accede to, and repudiated in the most formal and express manner that which they themselves had drawn up, and which, only a few days before, they had approved of as a combination of wisdom and diplomatic dexterity which had never been excelled?

But it was said that the interpretation which Count Nesselrode placed upon this note made it impossible for Turkey to accede to it. I very much doubt whether Count Nesselrode placed any meaning upon it which it did not fairly warrant, and it is impossible to say whether he really differed at all from the actual intentions of the four ambassadors at Vienna. But I can easily understand the course taken by the Russian minister. It was this: seeing the note was rejected by the Turk, and considering that its previous acceptance by Russia was some concession from the original demand, he issued a circular, giving such an explanation or interpretation of the Vienna note as might enable him to get back to his original position, and might save Russia from being committed and damaged by the concession, which, for the sake of peace, she had made. This circular, however, could make no real difference in the note itself; and, notwithstanding this circular, whatever the note really meant, it would have been just as binding upon Russia as any other note will be that may be drawn up and agreed to at the end of the war. Although, however, this note was considered inadmissible, negotiations were continued; and at the conference at Olmutz, at which the Earl of Westmoreland was present, the Emperor of Russia himself expressed his willingness to accept the Vienna note—not in the sense that Count Nesselrode had placed upon it, but in that which the ambassadors at Vienna declared to be its real meaning, and with such a clause as they should attach to it, defining its real meaning.

It is impossible from this fairly to doubt the sincerity of the desire for peace manifested by the Emperor of Russia. He would accept the note prepared by the conference at Vienna, sanctioned by the cabinets in London and Paris, and according to the interpretation put upon it by those by whom it had been prepared—such interpretation to be defined in a clause, to be by them attached to the original note. But in the precise week in which these negotiations were proceeding apparently to a favourable conclusion, the Turkish council, consisting of a large number of dignitaries of the Turkish empire—not one of whom, however, represented the Christian majority of the population of Turkey, but inspired by the fanaticism and desperation of the old Mohammedan party—assembled; and, fearful that peace would be established, and that they would lose the great opportunity of dragging England and France into a war with their ancient enemy the Emperor of Russia, they came to a sudden resolution in favour of war; and in the very week in which Russia agreed to the Vienna note in the sense of the Vienna conference, the Turks declared war against Russia—the Turkish forces crossed the Danube, and began the war, involving England in an inglorious and costly struggle, from which this Government and a succeeding Government may fail to extricate us.

I differ very much from those gentlemen who condemn the Government for the tardy nature of their proceedings. I never said or thought that the Government was not honestly anxious for peace; but I believe, and indeed I know, that at an early period they committed themselves and the country to a policy which left the issue of peace or war in other hands than their own—namely, in the hands of the Turks, the very last hands in which I am willing to trust the interests and the future of this country. In my opinion, the original blunder was committed when the Turks were advised to resist and not to concede; and the second blunder was made when the Turks were supported in their rejection of the Vienna note; for the moment the four powers admitted that their recommendation was not necessarily to be accepted by the Porte, they put themselves entirely into the hands of the Turk, and might be dragged into any depth of confusion and war in which that respectable individual might wish to involve them.

The course taken by Turkey in beginning the war was against the strong advice of her allies; but, notwithstanding this, the moment the step was taken, they turned round again, as in the ase of the Vienna note, and justified and de-

fended her in the course she had adopted, in defiance of the remonstrances they had urged against it. In his speech to-night, the noble lord [Lord J. Russell] has occupied some time in showing that Turkey was fully justified in declaring war. I should say nothing against that view, if Turkey were fighting on her own resources; but I maintain that, if she is in alliance with England and France, the opinions of those powers should at least have been heard, and that, in case of her refusal to listen to their counsel, they would have been justified in saying to her, "If you persist in taking your own course, we cannot be involved in the difficulties to which it may give rise, but must leave you to take the consequences of your own acts." But this was not said, and the result is, that we are dragged into a war by the madness of the Turk, which, but for the fatal blunders we have committed, we might have avoided.

There have been three plans for dealing with this Turkish question, advocated by as many parties in this country. The first finds favour with two or three gentlemen who usually sit on the bench below me—with a considerable number out of doors—and with a portion of the public press. These persons were anxious to have gone to war during last summer. They seem actuated by a frantic and bitter hostility to Russia, and, without considering the calamities in which they might involve this country, they have sought to urge it into a great war, as they imagined, on behalf of European freedom, and in order to cripple the resources of Russia. I need hardly say that I have not a particle of sympathy with that party, or with that policy. I think nothing can be more unwise than that party, and nothing more atrocious than their policy. But there was another cause recommended, and which the Government has followed. War delayed, but still certain—arrangements made which placed the issue of war in other hands than in those of the Government of this country—that is the policy which the Government has pursued, and in my opinion it is fatal to Turkey, and disastrous to England. There is a third course, and which I should have, and indeed have all along, recommended —that war should have been avoided by the acceptance on the part of Turkey either of the last note of Prince Menchikoff, or of the Vienna note; or, if Turkey would not consent to either, that then she should have been allowed to enter into the war alone, and England and France—supposing they had taken, and continued to take, the same view of the interests of Western Europe which they have hitherto taken—might have stood aloof until the time when there appeared some evident danger of the war being settled on terms destructive of the balance of power; and then they might have come in, and have insisted on a different settlement. I would either have allowed or compelled Turkey to yield, or would have insisted on her carrying on the war alone.

The question is, whether the advantages both to Turkey and England of avoiding war altogether, would have been less than those which are likely to arise from the policy which the Government has pursued? Now, if the noble lord the member for Tiverton is right in saying that Turkey is a growing power, and that she has elements of strength which unlearned persons like myself know nothing about; surely no immediate, or sensible, or permanent mischief could have arisen to her from the acceptance of the Vienna note, which all the distinguished persons who agreed to it have declared to be perfectly consistent with her honour and independence. If she has been growing stronger and stronger of late years, surely she would have grown still stronger in the future, and there might have been a reasonable expectation that, whatever disadvantages she might have suffered for a time from that note, her growing strength would have enabled her to overcome them, while the peace of Europe might have been preserved. But suppose that Turkey is not a growing power, but that the Ottoman rule in Europe is tottering to its fall, I come to the conclusion that, whatever advantages were afforded to the Christian population of Turkey would have enabled them to grow more rapidly in numbers, in industry, in wealth, in intelligence, and in political power; and that, as they thus increased in influence, they would have become more able, in case any accident, which might not be far distant, occurred, to supplant the Mohammedan rule, and to establish themselves in Constantinople as a Christian state, which, I think, every man who hears me will admit is infinitely more to be desired than that the Mohammedan power should be permanently sustained by the bayonets of France and the fleets of England. Europe would thus have been at peace; for I do not think even the most bitter enemies of Russia believe that the Emperor of Russia intended last year, if the Vienna note or Prince Menchikoff's last and most moderate proposition had been accepted, to have marched on Constantinople. Indeed, he had pledged himself in the most distinct manner to withdraw his troops at once from the principalities, if the Vienna note were accepted, and therefore in that case Turkey would have been delivered from the presence of the foe; peace would for a time have been secured to Europe; and the whole matter would have drifted on to its natural solution—which is, that the Mohammedan power in Europe should eventually succumb to the growing power of the Christian population of the Turkish territories.

The noble lord the member for London, and his colleague the noble lord the member for Tiverton, when they speak of the aggrandise-

ment of Russia relatively to the rest of Europe, always speak of the "balance of power," a term which it is not easy to define. It is a hackneyed term—a phrase to which it is difficult to attach any definite meaning. I wish the noble lord would explain what is meant by the balance of power. In 1791 the whole Whig party repudiated the proposition that Turkey had anything to do with the balance of power. Mr Burke, in 1791, when speaking on that subject, used the following language: "He had never heard it said before, that the Turkish empire was ever considered as any part of the balance of power in Europe. They had nothing to do with European policy; they considered themselves as wholly Asiatic. What had these worse than savages to do with the powers of Europe, but to spread war, destruction, and pestilence among them? The ministry and the policy which would give these people any weight in Europe, would deserve all the bans and curses of posterity. All that was holy in religion, all that was moral and humane, demanded an abhorrence of everything which tended to extend the power of that cruel and wasteful empire. Any Christian power was to be preferred to these destructive savages." Mr Whitbread, on the same occasion, said: "Suppose the empress at Constantinople, and the Turks expelled from the European provinces, would any unprejudiced man contend that by such an event mankind would not be largely benefited? Would any man contend that the expulsion of a race of beings whose abominable tyranny proscribed the arts, and literature, and everything that was good, and great, and amiable, would not conduce to the prosperity and happiness of the world? He was convinced it would. This was an event with which the paltry consideration of the nice adjustment of the balance in Europe was not to be put in competition, although he was a friend to that balance on broad and liberal principles. He abhorred the wretched policy which could entertain a wish that the most luxuriant part of the earth should remain desolate and miserable that a particular system might be maintained." And Mr Fox, when speaking of Mr Pitt's system, said—and be it remembered that nobody is so great an authority with the noble lord the member for London as Mr Fox, whose words I am now about to quote: "His [Mr Pitt's] defensive system was wicked and absurd—that every country which appeared, from whatever cause, to be growing great, should be attacked; that all the powers of Europe should be confined to the same precise situation in which this defensive system found them. . . . Her [Russia's] extent of territory, scanty revenue, and thin population made her power by no means formidable to us—a power whom we could neither attack nor be attacked by; and this was the power against which we were going to war. Overturning the Ottoman empire he conceived to be an argument of no weight. The event was not probable; and if it should happen, it was more likely to be of advantage than injurious to us."

It will probably be said that these were opinions held by gentlemen who sat on that side of the House, and who were ready to advocate any course that might serve to damage the ministers of the day. I should be sorry to think so, especially of a man whose public character is so much to be admired as that of Mr Fox; but I will come to a much later period, and produce authority of a very similar kind. Many hon. members now in the House recollect the late Lord Holland, and they all know his sagacity and what his authority was with the party with which he was connected. What did he say? Why, so late as the year 1828, when this question was mooted in the House of Lords, he said: "No, my Lords, I hope I shall never see—God forbid I ever should see—for the proposition would be scouted from one end of England to another—any preparations or any attempt to defend this our 'ancient ally' from the attacks of its enemies. There was no arrangement made in that treaty for preserving the crumbling and hateful, or, as Mr Burke called it, that wasteful and disgusting empire of the Turks, from dismemberment and destruction; and none of the powers who were parties to that treaty will ever, I hope, save the falling empire of Turkey from ruin."

I hope it will not be supposed that I am animated by any hostility to Turkey, in quoting sentiments and language such as this, for I have as much sympathy with what is just towards that country as any other man can have; but the question is, not what is just to Turkey, but what is just to this country, and what this House, as the depositary of the power of this country, has a right to do with regard to this most dangerous question. I am, therefore, at liberty to quote from the statesmen of 1791 and 1828, the political fathers and authorities of the noble lord the member for London, and to say, that if I hold opinions different from those held by the Government, I am, at least, not singular in those opinions, for I can quote great names and high authorities in support of the course I am taking.

This "balance of power" is in reality the hinge on which the whole question turns. But if that is so important as to be worth a sanguinary war, why did you not go to war with France when she seized upon Algiers? That was a portion of Turkey not quite so distinct, it is true, as are the Danubian principalities; but still Turkey had sovereign rights over Algiers. When, therefore, France seized on a large portion of the northern coast of Africa, might it not have been said that such an act tended to convert the Mediterranean into a French lake—

that Algiers lay next to Tunis, and that, having conquered Tunis, there would remain only Tripoli between France and Alexandria, and that the "balance of power" was being destroyed by the aggrandisement of France? All this might have been said, and the Government might easily have plunged the country into war on that question. But happily the Government of that day had the good sense not to resist, and the result had not been disadvantageous to Europe; this country had not suffered from the seizure of Algiers, and England and France had continued at peace.

Take another case—the case of the United States. The United States waged war with Mexico—a war with a weaker state—in my opinion, an unjust and unnecessary war. If I had been a citizen of the American republic, I should have condemned that war; but might it not have been as justly argued that, if we allowed the aggressive attacks of the United States upon Mexico, her insatiable appetite would soon be turned towards the north—towards the dependencies of this empire—and that the magnificent colonies of the Canadas would soon fall a prey to the assaults of their rapacious neighbour? But such arguments were not used, and it was not thought necessary to involve this country in a war for the support of Mexico, although the power that was attacking that country lay adjacent to their own dominions.

If this phrase of the "balance of power" is to be always an argument for war, the pretence for war will never be wanting, and peace can never be secure. Let any one compare the power of this country with that of Austria now, and forty years ago. Will any one say that England, compared with Austria, is now three times as powerful as she was thirty or forty years ago? Austria has a divided people, bankrupt finances, and her credit is so low that she cannot borrow a shilling out of her own territories; England has a united people, national wealth rapidly increasing, and a mechanical and productive power to which that of Austria is as nothing. Might not Austria complain that we have disturbed the "balance of power" because we are growing so much stronger from better government, from the greater union of our people, from the wealth that is created by the hard labour and skill of our population, and from the wonderful development of the mechanical resources of the kingdom, which is seen on every side? If this phrase of the "balance of power," the meaning of which nobody can exactly make out, is to be brought in on every occasion to stimulate this country to war, there is an end to all hope of permanent peace.

There is, indeed, a question of a "balance of power" which this country might regard, if our statesmen had a little less of those narrow views which they sometimes arrogantly impute to me and to those who think with me. If they could get beyond those old notions which belong to the traditions of Europe, and cast their eyes as far westward as they are now looking eastward, they might there see a power growing up in its gigantic proportions, which will teach us before very long where the true "balance of power" is to be found. This struggle may indeed begin with Russia, but it may end with half the states of Europe; for Austria and Prussia are just as likely to join with Russia as with England and France, and probably much more so; and we know not how long alliances which now appear very secure may remain so; for the circumstances in which the Government has involved us are of the most critical character, and we stand upon a mine which may explode any day. Give us seven years of this infatuated struggle upon which we are now entering, and let the United States remain at peace during that period, and who shall say what will then be the relative positions of the two nations? Have you read the reports of your own commissioners to the New York Exhibition? Do you comprehend what is the progress of that country, as exhibited in its tonnage, and exports, and imports, and manufactures, and in the development of all its resources, and the means of transit? There has been nothing like it hitherto under the sun. The United States may profit to a large extent by the calamities which will befall us; whilst we, under the miserable and lunatic idea that we are about to set the worn-out Turkish empire on its legs, and permanently to sustain it against the aggressions of Russia, are entangled in a war. Our trade will decay and diminish—our people, suffering and discontented, as in all former periods of war, will emigrate in increasing numbers to a country whose wise policy is to keep itself free from the entanglement of European politics—to a country with whom rests the great question, whether England shall, for any long time, retain that which she professes to value so highly—her great superiority in industry and at sea.

This whole notion of the "balance of power" is a mischievous delusion which has come down to us from past times; we ought to drive it from our minds, and to consider the solemn question of peace or war on more clear, more definite, and on far higher principles than any that are involved in the phrase the "balance of power." What is it the Government propose to do? Let us examine their policy as described in the message from the Crown, and in the address which has been moved to-night. As I understand it, we are asked to go to war to maintain the "integrity and independence of the Ottoman empire"—to curb the aggressive power of Russia—and to defend the interests of this country.

These are the three great objects to which the efforts and resources of this country are to be

directed. The noble lord the member for London is, I think, the author of the phrase "the integrity and independence" of Turkey. If I am not mistaken, he pledged himself to this more than a year ago, when he was Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in a letter to somebody at Newcastle-on-Tyne, in answer to an address from certain enthusiasts in that town, who exhorted the Government to step in for the support of the Ottoman empire. But what is the condition of that empire at this moment? I have already described to the House what it would have been if my policy had been adopted —if the thrice-modified note of Prince Menchikoff had been accepted, or if the Vienna note had been assented to by the Porte. But what is it now under the protection of the noble lord and his colleagues? At the present moment there are no less than three foreign armies on Turkish soil: there are 100,000 Russian troops in Bulgaria; there are armies from England and France approaching the Dardanelles, to entrench themselves on Turkish territory, and to return nobody knows when. All this can hardly contribute to the "independence" of any country. But more than this: there are insurrections springing up in almost every Turkish province, and insurrections which must, from the nature of the Turkish government, widely extend; and it is impossible to describe the anarchy which must prevail, inasmuch as the control heretofore exercised by the Government to keep the peace is now gone, by the withdrawal of its troops to the banks of the Danube; and the licence and demoralisation engendered by ages of bad government will be altogether unchecked. In addition to these complicated horrors, there are 200,000 men under arms; the state of their finances is already past recovery; and the allies of Turkey are making demands upon her far beyond anything that was required by Russia herself. Can anything be more destructive of the "integrity and independence" of Turkey than the policy of the noble lord?

I have seen only this day a letter in the *Times* from its correspondent at Constantinople, which states that Lord Stratford de Redcliffe and one of the pashas of the Porte had spent a whole night in the attempt to arrange concessions which her allies had required on behalf of the Christian population of Turkey. The Christians are to be allowed to hold landed property; the capitation tax is to be abolished—for they are actually contending for the abolition of that which the hon. member for Aylesbury [Mr Layard] says is a positive benefit to those upon whom it is imposed; and the evidence of Christians is to be admitted into courts of justice. But the *Times'* correspondent asks, What is the use of a decree at Constantinople, which will have no effect in the provinces? for the judges are Turks of the old school, and they will have little sympathy with a change under which a Christian in a court of justice is made equal with his master the Turk. This correspondent describes what Turkey really wants—not three foreign armies on her soil, nor any other thing which our Government is about to give her, but "a pure executive, a better financial administration, and sensible laws;" and it must be admitted that the true wants of the country are not likely soon to be supplied.

Now, so far as regards Turkey herself, and the "integrity and independence" of that empire, I put it seriously to the House—Do you believe that if the Government and Lord Stratford de Redcliffe had advised Turkey to accept the last note of Prince Menchikoff, a note so little different from the others, offered before and since, that it was impossible to discover in what the distinction consisted; or if the Government had insisted on Turkey accepting, as the condition of their co-operation, the Vienna note, either as at first proposed by the conference, or with the explanatory definitions with which the Emperor of Russia at Olmutz offered to accept it, that they would have injured the "integrity and independence" of Turkey? Nay, I will not insult you by asking whether, under such circumstances, that "integrity and independence" would not have been a thousand times more secure than it is at this hour? If that be true, then the "balance of power" theory has been entirely overthrown by the policy of the Government, for no one will argue that Turkey will come out of her present difficulties more able to cope with the power of Russia than she was before. With her finances hopelessly exhausted, will she ever again be able to raise an army of 200,000 men? But there are men, and I suspect there are statesmen in this country, and men in office, too, who believe that Turkey will not be Turkey at the end of this war—that she cannot come out of it an Ottoman power—that such a convulsion has been created, that while we are ready to contend with half the world to support the "integrity and independence" of the Ottoman empire, there will shortly be no Ottoman empire to take the benefit of the enormous sacrifices we are about to make.

But we are undertaking to repress and to curb Russian aggression. These are catching words; they have been amplified in newspapers, and have passed from mouth to mouth, and have served to blind the eyes of multitudes wholly ignorant of the details of this question. If Turkey has been in danger from the side of Russia heretofore, will she not be in far greater danger when the war is over? Russia is always there. You do not propose to dismember Russia, or to blot out her name from the map, and her history from the records of Europe. Russia will be always there—always powerful, always watchful, and actuated by the same motives of ambition, either of influence or of territory, which are supposed to have moved

her in past times. What, then, do you propose to do? and how is Turkey to be secured? Will you make a treaty with Russia, and force conditions upon her? But if so, what security have you that one treaty will be more binding than another? It is easy to find or make a reason for breaking a treaty when it is the interest of a country to break it.

I recollect reading a statement made by the illustrious Washington when it was proposed to land a French army in North America, to assist the colonies in overthrowing the yoke of this country. Washington was afraid of them—he did not know whether these allies, once landed, might not be as difficult to get rid of as the English troops he was endeavouring to expel; for, said he, "whatever may be the convention entered into, my experience teaches me that nations and governments rarely abide by conventions or treaties longer than it is their interest to do so." So you may make a treaty with Russia; but if Russia is still powerful and ambitious—as she certainly will be—and if Turkey is exhausted and enfeebled by the war—as she certainly will be—then I want to know what guarantee you have, the moment the resources of Russia have recovered from the utmost degree of humiliation and exhaustion to which you may succeed in reducing her, that she will not again insist on terms with Turkey infinitely more perilous than those you have ruined Turkey by urging her to refuse? It is a delusion to suppose you can dismember Russia—that you can blot her from the map of Europe—that you can take guarantees from her, as some seem to imagine, as easily as you take bail from an offender, who would otherwise go to prison for three months. England and France cannot do this with a stroke of the pen, and the sword will equally fail if the attempt be made.

But I come now to another point. How are the interests of England involved in this question. This is, after all, the great matter which we, the representatives of the people of England, have to consider. It is not a question of sympathy with any other state. I have sympathy with Turkey; I have sympathy with the serfs of Russia; I have sympathy with the people of Hungary, whose envoy the noble lord the member for Tiverton refused to see, and the overthrow of whose struggle for freedom by the armies of Russia he needlessly justified in this House; I have sympathy with the Italians, subjects of Austria, Naples, and the Pope; I have sympathy with the three millions of slaves in the United States; but it is not on a question of sympathy that I dare involve this country, or any other country, in a war which must cost an incalculable amount of treasure and of blood. It is not my duty to make this country the knight-errant of the human race, and to take upon herself the protection of the thousand millions of human beings who have been permitted by the Creator of all things to people this planet.

I hope no one will assume that I would invite—that is the phrase which has been used—the aggressions of Russia. If I were a Russian, speaking in a Russian Parliament, I should denounce any aggression upon Turkey, as I now blame the policy of our own Government; and I greatly fear I should find myself in a minority, as I now find myself in a minority on this question. But it has never yet been explained how the interests of this country are involved in the present dispute. We are not going to fight for tariffs, or for markets for our exports. In 1791 Mr Grey argued that, as our imports from Russia exceeded £1,000,000 sterling, it was not desirable that we should go to war with a country trading with us to that amount. In 1853 Russia exported to this country at least £14,000,000 sterling, and that fact affords no proof of the increasing barbarism of Russia, or of any disregard of her own interests as respects the development of her resources. What has passed in this House since the opening of the present session? We had a large surplus revenue, and our Chancellor of the Exchequer is an ambitious chancellor. I have no hope in any statesman who has no ambition; he can have no great object before him, and his career will be unmarked by any distinguished services to his country.

When the Chancellor of the Exchequer entered office, doubtless he hoped, by great services to his country, to build up a reputation such as a man may labour for and live for. Every man in this House, even those most opposed to him, acknowledged the remarkable capacity which he displayed during the last session, and the country has set its seal to this—that his financial measures, in the remission and readjustment of taxation, were worthy of the approbation of the great body of the people. The right hon. gentleman has been blamed for his speech at Manchester, not for making the speech, but because it differed from the tone of the speech made by the noble lord his colleague in office at Greenock. I observed that difference. There can be no doubt that there has been, and that there is now, a great difference of opinion in the cabinet on this Eastern Question. It could not be otherwise; and Government has gone on from one step to another; they have drifted—to use the happy expression of Lord Clarendon to describe what is so truly unhappy—they have drifted from a state of peace to a state of war; and to no member of the Government could this state of things be more distressing than to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, for it dashed from him the hopes he entertained that session after session, as trade extended and the public revenue increased, he would find himself the beneficent dispenser of blessings to the poor, and indeed to all classes of the people of this king-

dom. Where is the surplus now? No man dare even ask for it, or for any portion of it.

Here is my right hon. friend and colleague, who is resolved on the abolition of the newspaper stamp. I can hardly imagine a more important subject than that, if it be desirable for the people to be instructed in their social and political obligations; and yet my right hon. friend has scarcely the courage to ask for the abolition of that odious tax. I believe, indeed, that my right hon. friend has a plan to submit to the Chancellor by which the abolition of the stamp may be accomplished without sacrifice to the Exchequer, but that I will not go into at present. But this year's surplus is gone, and next year's surplus is gone with it; and you have already passed a bill to double the income-tax. And it is a mistake to suppose that you will obtain double the sum by simply doubling the tax. Many persons make an average of their incomes, and make a return accordingly. The average will not be sustained at the bidding of Parliament; and profits that were considerable last year, will henceforth show a great diminution, or will have vanished altogether. I mention this for the benefit of the country gentlemen, because it is plain that real property, lands, and houses, must bear the burden of this war; for I will undertake to say, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer will prefer to leave that bench, and will take his seat in some other quarter of the House, rather than retrace the steps which Sir Robert Peel took in 1842. He is not the promoter of this war; his speeches have shown that he is anxious for peace, and that he hoped to be a minister who would dispense fiscal blessings by lessening the taxes of the people; and I do not believe the right hon. gentleman will consent to be made the instrument to reimpose upon the country the excise duties which have been repealed, or the import duties which in past times inflicted such enormous injury upon trade. The property-tax is the lever, or the weapon, with which the proprietors of lands and houses in this kingdom will have to support the "integrity and independence" of the Ottoman empire. Gentlemen, I congratulate you, that every man of you has a Turk upon his shoulders.

The hon. member for Aylesbury spoke of our "triumphant position"—the position in which the Government has placed us by pledging this country to support the Turks. I see nothing like a triumph in the fact, that in addition to our many duties to our own country we have accepted the defence of twenty millions or more of the people of Turkey, on whose behalf, but, I believe, not for their benefit, we are about to sacrifice the blood and treasure of England. But there are other penalties and other considerations. I will say little about the Reform Bill, because, as the noble lord [Lord John Russell] is aware, I do not regard it as an unmixed blessing. But I think even hon. gentlemen opposite will admit that it would be well if the representation of the people in this House were in a more satisfactory state, and that it is unfortunate that we are not permitted, calmly, and with mutual good feeling, to consider the question, undisturbed by the thunder of artillery and undismayed by the disasters which are inseparable from a state of war.

With regard to trade, I can speak with some authority as to the state of things in Lancashire. The Russian trade is not only at an end, but it is made an offence against the law to deal with any of our customers in Russia. The German trade is most injuriously affected by the uncertainty which prevails on the Continent of Europe. The Levant trade, a very important branch, is almost extinguished in the present state of affairs in Greece, Turkey in Europe, and Syria. All property in trade is diminishing in value, whilst its burdens are increasing. The funds have fallen in value to the amount of about £120,000,000 sterling, and railway property is quoted at about £80,000,000 less than was the case a year ago. I do not pretend to ask the hon. member for Aylesbury [Mr Layard] to put these losses, these great destructions of property, against the satisfaction he feels at the "triumphant position" at which we have arrived. He may content himself with the dream that we are supporting the "integrity and independence" of Turkey, though I doubt whether bringing three foreign armies on her soil, raising insurrection in her provinces, and hopelessly exhausting her finances, is a rational mode of maintaining her as an independent power.

But we are sending out 30,000 troops to Turkey, and in that number are not included the men serving on board the fleets. Here are 30,000 lives! There is a thrill of horror sometimes when a single life is lost, and we sigh at the loss of a friend, or of a casual acquaintance! But here we are in danger of losing—and I give the opinions of military men and not my own merely—10,000, or it may be 20,000 lives, that may be sacrificed in this struggle. I have never pretended to any sympathy for the military profession—but I have sympathy for my fellow-men and fellow-countrymen, wherever they may be. I have heard very melancholy accounts of the scenes which have been witnessed in the separation from families occasioned by this expedition to the East. But it will be said, and probably the noble lord the member for Tiverton will say, that it is a just war, a glorious war, and that I am full of morbid sentimentality, and have introduced topics not worthy to be mentioned in Parliament. But these are matters affecting the happiness of the homes of England, and we, who are the representatives and guardians of those homes, when the grand question of war is before us, should

know at least that we have a case—that success is probable—and that an object is attainable, commensurate with the cost of war.

There is another point which gives me some anxiety. You are boasting of an alliance with France. Alliances are dangerous things. It is an alliance with Turkey that has drawn us into this war. I would not advise alliances with any nation, but I would cultivate friendship with all nations. I would have no alliance that might drag us into measures which it is neither our duty nor our interest to undertake. By our present alliance with Turkey, Turkey cannot make peace without the consent of England and France; and by this boasted alliance with France we may find ourselves involved in great difficulties at some future period of these transactions.

I have endeavoured to look at the whole of this question, and I declare, after studying the correspondence which has been laid on the table—knowing what I know of Russia and of Turkey—seeing what I see of Austria and of Prussia—feeling the enormous perils to which this country is now exposed, I am amazed at the course which the Government have pursued, and I am horrified at the results to which their policy must inevitably tend. I do not say this in any spirit of hostility to the Government. I have never been hostile to them. I have once or twice felt it my duty to speak, with some degree of sharpness, of particular members of the administration, but I suspect that in private they would admit that my censure was merited. But I have never entertained a party hostility to the Government. I know something of the difficulties they have had to encounter, and I have no doubt that, in taking office, they acted in as patriotic a spirit as is generally expected from members of this House. So long as their course was one which I could support, or even excuse, they have had my support. But this is not an ordinary question; it is not a question of reforming the University of Oxford, or of abolishing "ministers' money" in Ireland; the matter now before us affects the character, the policy, and the vital interests of the empire; and when I think the Government have committed a grievous—it may be a fatal—error, I am bound to tell them so.

I am told, indeed, that the war is popular, and that it is foolish and eccentric to oppose it. I doubt if the war is very popular in this House. But as to what is, or has been popular, I may ask, what was more popular than the American War? There were persons lately living in Manchester who had seen the recruiting party going through the principal streets of that city, accompanied by the parochial clergy in full canonicals, exhorting the people to enlist to put down the rebels in the American colonies. Where is now the popularity of that disastrous and disgraceful war, and who is the man to defend it? But if hon. members will turn to the correspondence between George III. and Lord North on the subject of that war, they will find that the king's chief argument for continuing the war was, that it would be dishonourable in him to make peace so long as the war was popular with the people. Again, what war could be more popular than the French war? Has not the noble lord [Lord John Russell] said, not long ago, in this House, that peace was rendered difficult, if not impossible, by the conduct of the English press in 1803? For myself, I do not trouble myself whether my conduct in Parliament is popular or not. I care only that it shall be wise and just as regards the permanent interests of my country, and I despise from the bottom of my heart the man who speaks a word in favour of this war, or of any war which he believes might have been avoided, merely because the press and a portion of the people urge the Government to enter into it.

I recollect a passage of a distinguished French writer and statesman, which bears strongly upon our present position, he says: "The country which can comprehend and act upon the lessons which God has given it in the past events of its history, is secure in the most imminent crisis of its fate." The past events of our history have taught me that the intervention of this country in European wars is not only unnecessary, but calamitous; that we have rarely come out of such intervention having succeeded in the objects we fought for; that a debt of £800,000,000 sterling has been incurred by the policy which the noble lord approves, apparently for no other reason than that it dates from the time of William III.; and that not debt alone has been incurred, but that we have left Europe at least as much in chains as before a single effort was made by us to rescue her from tyranny. I believe, if this country, seventy years ago, had adopted the principle of non-intervention in every case where her interests were not directly and obviously affected, we should have been saved from much of the pauperism and brutal crime by which the kingdom is overrun. This country might have been a garden, and every person who treads its soil might have been sufficiently educated. We should indeed have had less of military glory. We should have had neither Trafalgar nor Waterloo; but we should have set the high example of a Christian nation, free in its institutions, courteous and just in its conduct towards all foreign states, and resting its policy on the unchangeable foundation of Christian morality.

THE BURIALS BILL.*

It is admitted that the parochial burial-ground is intended for the service of all the inhabitants

* Delivered in the House of Commons, April 21, 1875.

of the parish, and that all have a right to use it when they go to bury their friends. Generally speaking, the parochial burial-ground has been created at the cost, and is maintained at the expense of the parish. I know hon. members will say no, but, at any rate, up to the time of the abolition of the church-rates, the burial-grounds were provided and supported by the parish. I presume that all the burial-grounds that were in existence before the passing of the Church-rates Abolition Bill were established at the cost of the parish, and therefore now are—as they all are indeed by a law—the property of the parish, and I am sure that hon. gentlemen opposite know that at the present time, notwithstanding the abolition of church-rates, there are thousands of Dissenters in this country who contribute voluntarily and constantly to the support both of the churches and the parochial graveyards. Therefore I have a right to say that these are grounds in which the parishioners generally are pecuniarily interested.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say that every parishioner has a right to be buried there, but only under the service of the Church of England. Now, it is quite open to persons if they like to dissent from the service of the Church of England. About half of the population of England and Wales have dissented, and, I think, that is a considerable matter when you are discussing this question. It is quite reasonable to expect and understand that nonconformists should prefer at a time like that of burial, and for a service of that nature, some other service and ceremony than that authorised by the Established Church. On the other hand, hon. members opposite say that they should have no service at all. But there are some who dislike that service, and are still of opinion that it is better to have some service rather than none, not for the sake of the dead—I hope no nonconformist, indeed, I am sure no nonconformist is so superstitious as to believe that—but for the sake of the living and those who surround the graves. Why is it that you impose this task? You admit that the graveyard is that of the parish, and that the body is that of a parishioner whom only last week you met in your village, or street, or garden. You propose that he should be buried in the parish churchyard, but they say not unless certain conditions are observed; and, first of all, that he shall have a service read over him which was ordained two or three hundred years ago, and which, I am willing to admit, is very impressive and beautiful, but which is nothing else. If he won't have this he is to have nothing at all. I won't say that he is to be buried like a dog, because that is a prejudice founded on a miserable superstition. I shall be buried like a dog, on that argument, and all those with whom I am connected and most love, and the society for which in past times my ancestors suffered persecution—they have all been buried like dogs, if that phrase be a just one. But, I ask, if half the population entertain this opinion, why is it that they should have this test imposed? You have abolished the tests for office, and why is it that when the body of a man comes to be interred, and his friends ask that this shall be done decently and solemnly, you say he shall not be interred here, even though his family, his parents, and his children may have been buried here, unless there is performed the service which we prescribe or no service at all. I would ask this question of hon. gentlemen opposite—"Why have you abolished tests in so many cases and yet adhere to this?" for it is no other than a test.

Take the case of my own sect. We have no baptism—we do not think it necessary. We have no ordered or stated service over the dead—we don't think it necessary. When a funeral takes place in my sect the body is borne with every decency and solemnity to the grave side; the coffin is laid by the side of the grave; and the family and friends and mourners stand around; they are given some fixed time—five minutes, ten minutes, or even longer—for that private and solemn meditation to which the grave invites the most unthinking and the most frivolous. If any one there felt it his duty to offer a word of exhortation he is at liberty to offer it, and if he feels that he can bow the knee and offer a prayer to Heaven, not for the dead, but for those who stand around the grave, or for the comfort of the widow, and for the succour and fatherly care of the children, that prayer is offered. Well, but if this were done in one of your graveyards; if it were to happen that a member of my sect were about to be interred in one of your graveyards, or a Wesleyan, or an Independent, or a Baptist, and some God-fearing and good man came forward to offer up a word of exhortation, and, falling on his knees, offered up a prayer. Is there one of you in this House, is there one of your clergymen who dare, in the sight of Heaven, condemn that act or attempt to interfere with it by course of law. I say, reduced to a special case like this, the proposition is simply monstrous and intolerable, and the time will come when the people of this country will not believe that it ever was sincerely discussed in the English House of Commons. Well, what is wanted by the preamble of this bill and the nonconformists of this country is, that Wesleyans, or Independents, or Baptists, or members of my own sect, should be permitted to enter the parochial graveyards, and to conduct what is commonly called a service, but which is merely a funeral ceremony on the principle which I have described. I admit that there is no written or printed form; but what does it signify whether there is a printed or an extemporary utterance of the heart on a solemn occasion like this. Without harm to the Church of England, but with great benefit to all Christian teaching, such a system might be wisely adopted by the

country. The right hon. gentleman opposite seems to think that a great grievance might happen, and that the feelings of ministers of the Church of England might be harassed. Well, no doubt if men have feelings of this kind nurtured by preference and monopoly, the time will come when these feelings will have to subside, or suffer something like discomfort. What is the case in Scotland? Last July I was in the graveyard of Lochnagar, and seeing a gravestone there I went to see what the inscription was upon it. I found it was the tomb of a minister who had been in the parish before the Disruption in 1843. After the Disruption the minister who seceded became the minister of the Free Church in the very same parish. At the end of his career he was buried, and he was buried alongside the very minister who succeeded him in the parish in which he was originally settled. In Scotland they know no difference of this kind. Hon. members may get up and say that in Scotland they care not about these things because their ground is not—what do they call it?—"consecrated"—because the ground is not consecrated. In Scotland they do not care about these things. May I tell hon. members opposite what is the course which the Scotch take in regard to the Episcopal Church? You have Scotch bishops and a Scotch clergy, and Scotchmen who are Episcopalians, and they are allowed in a Presbyterian churchyard to bury their dead, and to read the Episcopalian service. In Ireland it has been thought necessary to abolish the exclusive system, and if this be so, and if in Scotland Episcopalians are treated so liberally and justly, why are the nonconformists in England not treated likewise?

I appeal to the three or four hundred gentlemen in this House, all of whom, I presume, belong to the Established Church of England, and I will ask them why they consider it necessary to reject a bill like this. The right hon. gentleman the Secretary for the Home Department, said he did not object to the principle of the bill, and during the time the right hon. gentleman has held a seat in the House I consider he has always held views somewhat more liberal and in advance of his friends. The Home Secretary is willing to adopt something of the kind proposed in the bill, but which should be less hurtful to the feelings of the Church. I am sorry, however, that the right hon. gentleman, having made that admission, did not tell us in the course of his speech some mode by which this could be accomplished. If the right hon. gentleman could deal with the subject in a way which would be satisfactory, I am sure my hon. and learned friend will give him every assistance he can, even to the extent probably of withdrawing this bill.

There is only one other observation I desire to make, and it is to allude to another point which bears upon the one under consideration. All the feelings expressed to-day I have heard and seen expressed twenty times since I have been in Parliament, on the subject of church-rates. Hon. members opposite know what they prophesied, and what has been fulfilled. We are told that all the churches are falling to decay, and all the churchyards and everything in connection with the Church would suffer if the church-rates were abolished. I, however, believe at this moment there never was a time since the Church of England existed when churches and churchyards were kept in such admirable order as they are now. There never was a time when so many churches were being repaired and rebuilt, and new ones erected, since the time when people were first compelled to subscribe for them. There can be no doubt that the voluntary efforts of the people have done more for the Church of England than any law that this Parliament can discuss. You may say that I cannot place myself in the position of a Churchman, but I will tell you this, that if you would deal with nonconformists with more consideration, more condescension, more Christian kindness, more liberality in matters of this sort, I suspect you would find that the strength of the Church would not be lessened but increased; that the hostility would be lessened, and that there would be a general subsidence of the something like animosity which must to some extent always prevail where there is a favoured and Established Church. This is a political question, as church-rates was a political question. Churchmen in the country, however, wherever we meet them, do not discuss this question as it was discussed in Parliament. Parliament is more political, and these are made questions of party; and in questions of party, and in party discussions, I am afraid sometimes common sense, and very often Christian thought and Christian liberality, are almost entirely forgotten. If we can get rid of party and consider the question as men anxious for the welfare, not only of the Church, but of nonconformists anxious for that brotherly kindness and that peace which is inculcated in all of us by the precepts of Christianity, the House will have no difficulty in reading a second time by a larger majority the bill now before it.

[When the House divided there was a majority of 14 against the second reading.]

PEACE AND WAR.

[An address given at Llandudno, November 22, 1876, at the close of a lecture on "International Arbitration," delivered by the Rev. W. Glover, Manchester, in St George's Hall.]

It gave me great pleasure two or three days ago to see on the walls of your town a placard announcing that Mr Glover was about to come amongst you to deliver a lecture upon the momentous question of peace and war, and I

received—I don't know whether it was a deputation or not—but I had an interview with three of your townsmen, much respected and influential amongst you, who did me the honour of asking me to attend this meeting, and to add whatever I might be able to add to the arguments which would be brought before you by the lecturer. I could not well resist the urgent invitation which was offered me. I am not, as you know, what is called a resident of Llandudno, but I have been here almost every year for more than twenty years past, and I felt that I had something like a special interest in the people amongst whom I had spent so much time during many months in the year. I was labouring under serious and prolonged illness during one visit which my family paid to this place; we were struck by a very heavy and grievous affliction. These things dwell in memory, and they strengthen and deepen the interest which they feel, and which I feel, for everything connected with the interests of this town. And I may say that I have watched its growth and its increasing prosperity with as much interest as if I had been settled permanently amongst you. And when I look at the position of our town and its beautiful bay, when I look around and see the beauties of our locality, when I remember how near you are to all the finest scenery of this glorious North Wales, and when I observe and enjoy the beauty of our climate, which in winter, I believe, is not surpassed by that of any other place in the United Kingdom, and when I remember all the courtesy and all the kind attention which I have met, I am free to say that I have great faith in your future, and I hope and believe that your growth and prosperity will be continued, and will be lasting.

The lecture which we have heard—and which, I am afraid, the modesty of Mr Glover has induced him, because I was to follow him, to cut shorter than he would otherwise have done—is one which has interested me very much, and I think it is well timed. For there could scarcely be a period within our recollection—not more than one or two, I think—when questions of greater importance were stirring the minds of the people from one end of the kingdom to the other. It is to me astounding when I look back and see what has been the error and the folly into which the people of this country have been led in time past upon the question of war. We live in two considerable islands—Great Britain and Ireland. We are separated from the Continent by a sea passage, which in itself is a great defence, and we have been for about three hundred years unassailed, and believe, with our population, and our wealth, and our means, and our freedom, we are practically more unassailable than almost any other kingdom in the world. And yet, notwithstanding all that, we have spent, probably, in a period that does not go back beyond the lifetime of persons now living, two thousand millions of money in war, all of which, I believe, might with honour have been avoided, and in needless or excessive armaments in preparing for war. Mr Glover has referred to the fifty millions which we are spending every year—one-half of it paying the interest of money borrowed to carry on wars in past time, and the other half spent annually on the army and navy for the purposes of supposed defence, or for purposes of war in which we may be hereafter involved. Mr Glover quoted an expression of Lord Russell's, that he doubted whether there had been any war during the last hundred years that might not have been avoided without any sacrifice of the interests or honour of this country, by those reasonable concessions which we are constantly making amongst each other as individuals, and which would be in no degree injurious or dishonourable if made between nations.

A hundred years ago—just a hundred years ago this very year—this country was engaged in a war with the colonies now forming the United States of America. What happened when that war was over? A change of opinion extraordinary—no, not extraordinary, for it always takes place—but a change of opinion very remarkable. Whilst the war was going on, people in many parts of the country were in favour of it, and the king and his ministers were doggedly determined to continue the war. But a few years after it was over, everybody condemned it, and now, probably, there is no single man in this country, of any political party, however benighted, however ignorant, however positive, however unteachable, who would not condemn the folly and wickedness of that war with the American colonies. Well, but that war was supposed to have cost this country close upon one hundred millions of money, and it left between the inhabitants of these colonies—grown now to be a great nation, even greater in numbers than this, so far as the population of Great Britain and Ireland may be counted—it left feelings of anger and bitterness which are now only slowly passing away from amongst us. But after the American War was over only a few years, we engaged in another and still greater and more prolonged struggle with the republic of France; and the reason we went into war with France was because France was a republic, and held opinions supposed to be dangerous to the monarchy and aristocracy of this country; and that war was continued afterwards for the overthrow of the Emperor Napoleon, and concluded, after about twenty-two years' existence. The cost to this country, I dare say, all told, was a thousand millions sterling; and yet now everybody—nobody more than Lord Russell—everybody, or almost everybody, condemns that war; and I believe that by greater moderation and greater wisdom, on the part of the Government and the press and the people of this

country, it might have been avoided. It left us with five hundred millions of debt accumulated, in addition to the previous debts, during the continuance of that one single but prolonged struggle. We condemned, as I said, the American War a few years after it was over; I mean that your forefathers did. Our fathers condemned the French war not long after it was over; and since then we have had another war of great magnitude, but not of very long continuance, to which Mr Glover has referred, which generally goes by the name of the Crimean War—war with Russia—the main portion of the struggle taking place in the Crimea. But now, as far as I can judge, everybody—perhaps I ought not to say "everybody," because, perhaps, her Majesty's ministers would not agree with me, but nearly everybody condemns that war; and I think every single man who knows anything about it would admit that we gained absolutely nothing but discredit and loss—loss of life and increased debt—from the struggle which this country carried on with Russia twenty-two years ago. In the placard to which I have referred calling this meeting there is a statement of how much is spent every year in armaments and matters connected with wars past or to come—how much a month, how much a week, how much a day, how much an hour, and I don't know whether it is not my duty to say how much per minute. But now take another illustration. You can form some idea of an estate of 2000 acres of the best land in your Welsh counties, and you will perhaps be surprised when I tell you that our expenditure of fifty millions per year for past wars and for present military expenses is equal to the swallowing up every day for the six working days of every week during the year of an estate of that magnitude. Now, can it be possible that anything like this is necessary? It seems to me that the whole world is wrong; that everything is wrong in the creation and arrangement of the conditions under which men live on this earth, if man himself is not very wrong, having brought matters to this dreadful condition.

Take the last great case that I have referred to—the case of the Russian or Crimean War. At the time when it was being waged, there was not one man in twenty who really knew anything about it. At this moment I don't believe you could find one man in a hundred throughout England who could give you any clear account of the war—the progress of negotiations, the difficulties which were met with, and which were not overcome, and, finally, of the state of things which precipitated the catastrophe and brought on that lamentable and most inglorious struggle. But now look back to the passions which were exhibited at that time. You see what a change has come. Like as it was with the American War, that was condemned; as it was after the French war, that was condemned; so it is now after the Russian war, that is all but universally condemned, so that we have come—I believe the nation has come mainly and by a vast majority—to the conclusion that the object was unworthy of our efforts, and that the result was absolute and entire failure. But leaving for a moment the question of expense, I will ask you to consider the question of the loss of life. Mr Glover has told you not one-twentieth of the loss of life in that war. A most minute and careful history of the war has been written by a gentleman with whom I am acquainted, who was in Parliament for several years, very near where I sat—Mr Kinglake, who has paid most scrupulous attention to every fact with regard to the war, and I see it quoted from his book that he believes, first and last, that not less than one million of men lost their lives in connection with that struggle. Remember who were concerned. The chief were Russia, Turkey, England, France, and the kingdom of Sardinia, which is now the kingdom of Italy. The French lost more men, I believe, than we did, the Turks possibly more than either of them; the loss of Russia is not to be counted; and we stand now in this lamentable and terrible condition, that we were the country that went rashly and violently and passionately into the war. We have not a single thing of the slightest value to show for it, but on the other side we have that vast loss of treasure, and sacrifice and slaughter of a million of human beings.

Some people think that the loss of life in war is a very common thing, and that it is not worth talking about. They think a soldier takes his wages and stands his chance. I recollect being disgusted during the time of the war by the observation of a gentleman at the dinner of a person of high rank in this country, and of the party by whom the war was originated. He said: "As for the men that are killed, I think nothing of that. A man can only die once, and it does not matter very much where he dies or how he dies." Now, I think it matters a good deal. It matters a good deal to widows and orphans, and sisters and friends. It matters a good deal to thousands, scores of thousands, and hundreds of thousands of men who are cut off in the very flower of their youth, that they should be thrust with the passionate thrust of a bayonet, or rent asunder by shot and shell—killed it may be at once, or left lingering on the field or in hospital, dying of intense and inconceivable agonies. What is it that is so valuable as life? What happens if some unfortunate visitor to this place, or unfortunate and helpless boatman is drowned in your bay? Does it not make a sensation in your community? Is there not a feeling of grief that passes from heart to heart until there is not one man, woman, or child amongst you that did not feel that a calamity has happened in your neighbourhood? And what if there be a wreck? I was in this neighbourhood two or three days after the wreck of the "Rothe-

say Castle," forty-five or forty-six years ago, and I suppose nearly a hundred men and women were drowned on that occasion. I was down at the scene of the wreck of the "Royal Charter" only a few years ago, when nearly four hundred persons were drowned. Did it matter nothing? I saw a poor grey-headed man there wandering along the beach, as he wandered day after day in hope, not that he might find his son alive, but that he might find even the dead body of his son, that he might be comforted by giving it a fitting burial. These things gave a shock to the whole district, to the whole nation, and rightly and inevitably so. Look, again, to the accidents on railways. Take the sad accident in this county—the most appalling that has ever happened on any railway in this kingdom—I mean the accident at Abergele, when men were destroyed in a moment, apparently without a moment's warning. Take the terrible accidents that happen from time to time in the collieries in various parts of the country. See what woe is caused by them, and remember, as you must remember, how every family in the country is stirred and filled with grief at the narrative of the disasters that have occurred. Well, now, take other things that happen that distress us connected with the loss of life. Take the private murders that are committed throughout the kingdom, and hangings that take place of the criminals who have been guilty of these murders. All these things fill us at times with sorrow, and cover our feelings and our hearts with gloom; and now take together all the accidents from boats that you have ever heard of, all the accidents from shipwrecks that have ever been recorded; take all the accidents on railways since railways were first made, and all the accidents in mines since the bowels of the earth were penetrated to obtain coal for the use of man; and besides these, take all the lamentable private murders which have been caused by passion, or cupidity, or vengeance; and take all the hangings of all the criminals—and there have been far too many under the law of this country—more brutal in this matter, I believe, in past times than even now, and than the laws of any other Christian country—I say take all these phases of destruction of human life, add them all together, and bring them into one, bring them all into one great sum, and what are they in comparison with the millions of human beings who have been destroyed and slaughtered in a single Russian war! And the war only lasted two years, and the French war lasted more than twenty years. Almost half the time from the accession of William III. in this country up to 1875—almost if not more than half that time—this Christian country was engaged in sanguinary struggles with some other so-called Christian nations on the Continent of Europe. Now, seeing what was paid for the Russian war, and seeing what an entire failure it turned out with regard to the pretended objects which it was supposed likely to secure—the people of England did not go into war in their passionate moments without some idea that some good is to follow—seeing how much we have lost, and how great was the crime we committed, is it not astounding there should be any man, much more than that man should be in the lofty position of Prime Minister—ruler of this nation—who should by unadvised, unwise speaking invite the nation to involve itself in another war that may be no less prolonged, that may cause equal loss and equal slaughter, and that undoubtedly will result in a total failure, as the war twenty-two years ago which we had.

And it is the old story now just as it was in those days—that Russia is an aggressive power. I am afraid almost all powers, as opportunity offers, have been aggressive; but he would be a most ingenious calculator who could show that there was any power in the wide world that during the last hundred years has been more aggressive than that power of which we in this meeting form a humble and small party. It is said now, as it was said then, that Russia was aggressive, and that Russia intended to conquer Turkey, and capture and hold Constantinople, and to dominate alike over Europe and over Asia. There was not the slightest proof of it. All the proof was the other way. Russia from the beginning of these disturbances has made the most distinct and frank offers to the English Government as to the terms in which the Russian Government and people believe that peace might be made, to the enormous and permanent advantage of the Christian subjects of the Porte. It is said—it was said then—that Turkey was the only safe keeper of the straits of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles—that is, the straits which lead from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean. There was no proof that Turkey is the safe keeper of those straits. The Porte held those straits for three hundred years, and would not allow any mercantile ship to pass through them, and it was only by the power of Russia, and by a treaty with Russia after the war with Russia, that these straits were opened to the navigation of the mercantile ships of the world. And no doubt the time will come, and must come, when these straits will be opened, not only to mercantile ships, but to the ships of the navies of all nations of the world. Now and at a former time it was said, too, that England's interests were at stake—interests in India and interests in the Levant. There was no proof of it then; there is no proof of it now. Of all the speakers in public, of all writers in the press who have written against Russia in this matter and in favour of Turkey, and in favour of war, there is not one of them who has been able to lay down accurately and distinctly any kind of proof that the interests or honour of England were concerned in the course we

have taken with regard to this great Eastern Question. Why, if you were some poor and hapless criminal brought to trial before one of your courts, and before a jury, if liberty only is at stake, there is more care still. You have advocates on each side, you have witnesses for the prosecution and for the defence, you have an impartial jury, and the judge is careful that nothing shall be said against the prisoner that is not proved, and he warns the jury against being actuated by prejudice, and to put away what they have heard before the trial comes on, and he entreats them, if there be any feature in the case which can leave a doubt on the mind of any one of them as to the guilt of the poor wretch at the bar, that they shall give their verdict in his favour. But here you go into a great transaction, a great war, you spend your millions of money, you send your brothers and sons to the slaughter, and you condemn to death, it may be, as in the last case, a million of human beings, and you have not got a single definite or proved fact to justify the course you have taken.

I deny altogether that there is anything in the aggressive character of Russia, or anything with regard to the guardianship of the straits, or anything with which the honour and the interests of England is concerned, to justify us in the course we are taking with regard to this matter, or that justified us twenty years ago in that war, or would justify us now if the Government were to involve the country in another struggle. Look at the map of Europe and measure the distance from London, or if you like from the Land's End, round by Gibraltar, the whole length of the Mediterranean, through the Sea of Marmora to Constantinople, you will find that we are close upon three thousand miles away. Does any man believe that the honour and interests of England are so involved in the question of territory or of conquest in that part of the world, that it can justify us in vast, tremendous, and incalculable sacrifices for a war of this nature. The nations that are nearer to Russia are not afraid of her. Germany is a powerful country, and Austria is powerful, though less powerful than Germany; but both of them have interests as direct and as clear as any interest that we can pretend to have, and yet they can be tranquil. They do not get into a passion. Their Prime Ministers do not speak —what shall I call it?—rhodomontade and balderdash. They do not blow the trumpet and call the nations to arms for purely fancied causes, like those in which—I say it with as much sincerity as ever I have said anything in my life—in which we have as much interest as would justify us in sending one single man to slaughter. But I hope and I believe that out of this matter there will not be war. The statements that are offered to us in the newspapers this morning appear to me as likely very much to soothe anxieties which we sometimes feel upon this matter. There is a conversation which has taken place between the English minister to Russia and the Emperor of Russia. I believe no man in the world who knows anything about the Emperor of Russia doubted for a moment that he at least is as anxious for peace as any of the statesmen of either party in this country—and I think the explicit declarations which he has made are immensely to his credit—not merely the opinions which he holds and which he has declared; but in his position he has condescended to make these expressive declarations with a view to appeal to the common sense and good sense, the peaceful feeling if you like, the Christian and human feeling, of the population of England. Now, the public, notwithstanding what I say, are not wholly free from terror and from suspicion of the Russian power, but their conscience has been touched by some knowledge of the past, and by the horrors committed by the Turks, of which, bad as they are, only a faint outline has been fully narrated to us even by the correspondents of the London papers. But they hesitate still, and I believe they will not be dragged into war at the bidding of any minister. If public opinion be right, the Government, I think, in this matter will not go wrong.

There is one point with regard to this question, not with regard to the Eastern Question, but rather with regard to the question which was specially brought before us by Mr Glover in his interesting speech, on which I would like to make two or three observations. I think we ought to begin to ask ourselves how it is that Christian nations should be involved in so many wars? If one may presume to ask one's self what, in the eye of the Supreme Ruler, is the greatest crime which His creatures commit, I think we may almost with certainty conclude that it is the crime of war. Some one has described it as the sum of all villainies. It has been the cause of sufferings, misery, and slaughter which neither tongue nor pen can ever describe, and all this has been going on for eighteen hundred years after men have adopted the religion whose Founder and whose Head is denominated the Prince of Peace. It was announced as a religion which was intended to bring "peace on earth, and goodwill toward men;" and yet, after all these years, peace on earth has not come, and the goodwill among men is only partially and occasionally exhibited, and amongst nations we find almost no trace of it century after century. Now, in this country we have a great institution called the Established Church. I suppose that great institution numbers 20,000 or more places of worship, churches in various parts of the kingdom. I think this does not include what there are in Scotland and Ireland. With these 20,000 churches there are at least 20,000 men, educated and for the most part Christian men, anxious to

do their duty as teachers of the religion of peace; and besides these there are 20,000 other churches which are not connected with the Established institution, but have been built and are maintained by that portion of the people who go generally under the name of Dissenters or Nonconformists, and they have other 20,000 ministers also—men as well educated in the bulk, as much Christian and devoted men, as the others, and they are at work continually from day to day, and they preach from Sabbath to Sabbath what they believe to be the doctrines of the Prince of Peace; and yet, notwithstanding all that, war, profligate war, is either just behind us or it is just before us, and we have twenty-five or twenty-six millions a year spent in sustaining armies and navies in view of wars which may suddenly and soon take place. Now, why is it, I should like to ask, if there be any clergyman of the Church of England, or any ministers of a nonconformist body here, and if my words should go from this platform to a wider circle than can now hear me, I would ask all these ministers of these churches—on this point there can be no difference between church and chapel, for all these teachers and preachers profess to be the servants of the Most High God, and teachers of the doctrines of His Divine Son—and being such, may I not appeal to them and say: What have you 40,000 or 50,000 men, with such vast influences, what have you been doing with this great question during all the years that you have ministered and called yourselves ministers of the Prince of Peace? And I would not confine my appeal to them only, but to the devout men of every church and every chapel who surround the minister and uphold his hand, who did in many things his bidding, and who join him heartily and conscientiously in his work. I say—What are they doing? Why is it that there has never been a combination of all religious and Christian teachers of the country with the view of teaching the people what is true, what is Christian, upon this subject? I believe it has been within the power of the churches to do far more than statesmen can do in matters of this kind. I believe they might so bring this question home to the hearts and consciences of the Christian and good men of their congregations that a great combination of public opinion might be created which would wholly change the aspect of this question in this country and before the world, and would bring to the minds of statesmen that they are not the rulers of the colonists of Greece, or of the marauding hordes of ancient Rome, but that they are, or ought to be, the Christian rulers of a Christian people.

And now I have said all that is necessary on this occasion. I ought to say I only engaged with my friends who called upon me to make a few observations which might arise out of the lecture which we expected would be delivered, and which to-night we have heard with so much pleasure. It is not to be supposed, of course, that a small town, just as it were new-born into the family of towns like Llandudno, should have a powerful influence upon public opinion, and upon Government. You represent a small town with a small population; you cannot control or terrify a feeble, or unwise, or unprincipled administration, but you can add to the great volume of sound opinion throughout the country, whose mandate such administration dare not in the long-run disobey.

In Wales, there is much that Welshmen have to be proud of. There is no part of the country, I believe, where, for the population, there are so few offences committed against the law; there is no part of the country in which the people by voluntary effort have done so much for education and for the teaching of the Christian religion; there is no part of the country to which Englishmen can come with so much pleasure to behold all that is beautiful in nature, and all that the inhabitants of this district have so much reason to love and to be proud of. May I ask you then to do what you can—you are not asked to do more, but whoever you may come in contact with, whenever you may have the opportunity of discussing this great question, to go to the kernel of it, stripped of all the husk by which statesmen and the press succeed so often in misleading the people; go to the kernel of the matter, and ask yourself the question—Can it be your duty to send out your sons and brothers three thousand miles to the slaughter—it may be of the Russians or any other people—can it be your duty to do this? Ask your consciences within the sight of Heaven if it can be your duty; and if you cannot find an answer in the affirmative, then I say, have nothing to do with the accursed system, and wherever your influence extends, let it be honestly and earnestly in favour of Christianity and of peace.

CHARLES DICKENS.

1812-1870.

SELECTED ADDRESSES DELIVERED ON VARIOUS OCCASIONS.

[SPOKEN at a public dinner given at Edinburgh, June 25, 1841, presided over by Professor Wilson.]

If I felt your warm and generous welcome less, I should be better able to thank you. If I could have listened as you have listened to the glowing language of your distinguished chairman, and if I could have heard as you heard the "thoughts that breathe and words that burn," which he has uttered, it would have gone hard but I should have caught some portion of his enthusiasm, and kindled at his example. But every word which fell from his lips, and every demonstration of sympathy and approbation with which you received his eloquent expressions, renders me unable to respond to his kindness, and leaves me at last all heart and no lips, yearning to respond as I would do to your cordial greeting—possessing, Heaven knows, the will, and desiring only to find the way.

The way to your good opinion, favour, and support, has been to me very pleasing—a path strewn with flowers and cheered with sunshine. I feel as if I stood amongst old friends, whom I had intimately known and highly valued. I feel as if the deaths of the fictitious creatures, in which you have been kind enough to express an interest, had endeared us to each other as real afflictions deepen friendships in actual life; I feel as if they had been real persons, whose fortunes we had pursued together in inseparable connection, and that I had never known them apart from you.

It is a difficult thing for a man to speak of himself or of his works. But, perhaps, on this occasion I may, without impropriety, venture to say a word on the spirit in which mine were conceived. I felt an earnest and humble desire, and shall do till I die, to increase the stock of harmless cheerfulness. I felt that the world was not utterly to be despised; that it was worthy of living in for many reasons. I was anxious to find, as the professor has said, if I could, in evil things, that soul of goodness which the Creator has put in them. I was anxious to show that virtue may be found in the by-ways of the world, that it is not incompatible with poverty, and even with rags, and to keep steadily through life the motto, expressed in the burning words of your Northern poet:

"The rank is but the guinea stamp,
The man's the gowd for a' that."

And in following this track, where could I have better assurance that I was right, or where could I have stronger assurance to cheer me on than in your kindness on this to me memorable night?

I am anxious and glad to have an opportunity of saying a word in reference to one incident in which I am happy to know you were interested, and still more happy to know, though it may sound paradoxical, that you were disappointed—I mean the death of the little heroine. When I first conceived the idea of conducting that simple story to its termination, I determined rigidly to adhere to it, and never to forsake the end I had in view. Not untried in the school of affliction, in the death of those we love, I thought what a good thing it would be if in my little work of pleasant amusement I could substitute a garland of fresh flowers for the sculptured horrors which disgrace the tomb. If I have put into my book anything which can fill the young mind with better thoughts of death, or soften the grief of older hearts; if I have written one word which can afford pleasure or consolation to old or young in time of trial, I shall consider it as something achieved—something which I shall be glad to look back upon in after-life. Therefore I kept to my purpose, notwithstanding that towards the conclusion of the story I daily received letters of remonstrance, especially from the ladies. God bless them for their tender mercies! The professor was quite right when he said that I had not reached to an adequate delineation of their virtues; and I fear that I must go on blotting their characters in endeavouring to reach the ideal in my mind. These letters were, however, combined with others from the sterner sex, and some of them were not altogether free from personal invective. But, notwithstanding, I kept to my purpose, and I am happy to know that many of those who at first condemned me are now foremost in their approbation.

If I have made a mistake in detaining you with this little incident, I do not regret having done so; for your kindness has given me such a confidence in you, that the fault is yours and not mine. I come once more to thank you, and here I am in a difficulty again. The distinction you have conferred upon me is one which I never hoped for, and of which I never dared to dream. That it is one which I shall never forget, and that while I live I shall be proud of its remembrance, you must well know. I believe I shall never hear the name of this capital of Scotland without a thrill of gratitude and pleasure. I shall love while I have life her people, her hills,

and her houses, and even the very stones of her streets. And if in the future works which may lie before me you should discern—God grant you may!—a brighter spirit and a clearer wit, I pray you to refer it back to this night, and point to that as a Scottish passage for evermore. I thank you again and again, with the energy of a thousand thanks in each one, and I drink to you with a heart as full as my glass, and far easier emptied, I do assure you.

[Reply to the toast, "Health, happiness, and a hearty welcome to Charles Dickens:" spoken at a dinner given in his honour at Boston, February 1, 1842.]

GENTLEMEN,—If you had given this splendid entertainment to any one else in the whole wide world—if I were to-night to exult in the triumph of my dearest friend—if I stood here upon my defence, to repel any unjust attack—to appeal as a stranger to your generosity and kindness as the freest people on the earth—I could, putting some restraint upon myself, stand among you as self-possessed and unmoved as I should be alone in my own room in England. But when I have the echoes of your cordial greeting ringing in my ears; when I see your kind faces beaming a welcome so warm and earnest as never man had—I feel, it is my nature, so vanquished and subdued, that I have hardly fortitude enough to thank you. If your president, instead of pouring forth that delightful mixture of humour and pathos which you have just heard, had been but a caustic, ill-natured man—if he had only been a dull one—if I could only have doubted or distrusted him or you, I should have had my wits at my fingers' ends, and, using them, could have held you at arm's-length. But you have given me no such opportunity; you take advantage of me in the tenderest point; you give me no chance of playing at company, or holding you at a distance, but flock about me like a host of brothers, and make this place like home. Indeed, gentlemen, indeed, if it be natural and allowable for each of us, on his own hearth, to express his thoughts in the most homely fashion, and to appear in his plainest garb, I have a fair claim upon you to let me do so to-night, for you have made my home an Aladdin's palace. You fold so tenderly within your breasts that common household lamp in which my feeble fire is all enshrined, and at which my flickering torch is lighted up, that straight my household gods take wing, and are transported there. And whereas it is written of that fairy structure that it never moved without two shocks—one when it rose, and one when it settled down—I can say of mine that, however sharp a tug it took to pluck it from its native ground, it struck at once an easy and a deep and lasting root into this soil; and loved it as its own. I can say more of it, and say with truth, that long before it moved, or had a chance of moving, its master—perhaps from some secret sympathy between its timbers, and a certain stately tree that has its being hereabout, and spreads its broad branches far and wide—dreamed by day and night, for years, of setting foot upon this shore, and breathing this pure air. And, trust me, gentlemen, that, if I had wandered here, unknowing and unknown, I would—if I know my own heart—have come with all my sympathies clustering as richly about this land and people—with all my sense of justice as keenly alive to their high claims on every man who loves God's image—with all my energies as fully bent on judging for myself, and speaking out, and telling in my sphere the truth, as I do now, when you rain down your welcomes on my head.

Our president has alluded to those writings which have been my occupation for some years past; and you have received his allusions in a manner which assures me—if I needed any such assurance—that we are old friends in the spirit, and have been in close communion for a long time.

It is not easy for a man to speak of his own books. I daresay that few persons have been more interested in mine than I, and if it be a general principle in nature that a lover's love is blind, and that a mother's love is blind, I believe it may be said of an author's attachment to the creatures of his own imagination, that it is a perfect model of constancy and devotion, and is the blindest of all. But the objects and purposes I have had in view are very plain and simple, and may be easily told. I have always had, and always shall have, an earnest and true desire to contribute, as far as in me lies, to the common stock of healthful cheerfulness and enjoyment. I have always had, and always shall have, an invincible repugnance to that mole-eyed philosophy which loves the darkness, and winks and scowls in the light. I believe that virtue shows quite as well in rags and patches as she does in purple and fine linen. I believe that she and every beautiful object in external nature, claims some sympathy in the breast of the poorest man who breaks his scanty loaf of daily bread. I believe that she goes barefoot as well as shod. I believe that she dwells rather oftener in alleys and by-ways than she does in courts and palaces, and that it is good, and pleasant, and profitable to track her out, and follow her. I believe that to lay one's hand upon some of those rejected ones whom the world has too long forgotten, and too often misused, and to say to the proudest and most thoughtless: "These creatures have the same elements and capacities of goodness as yourselves, they are moulded in the same form, and made of the same clay; and though ten times worse than you, may, in having retained anything of their

original nature amidst the trials and distresses of their condition, be really ten times better"—I believe that to do this is to pursue a worthy and not useless vocation. Gentlemen, that you think so too, your fervent greeting sufficiently assures me. That this feeling is alive in the old world as well as in the new, no man should know better than I—I, who have found such wide and ready sympathy in my own dear land. That in expressing it, we are but treading in the steps of those great master-spirits who have gone before, we know by reference to all the bright examples in our literature, from Shakespeare downward.

There is one other point connected with the labours (if I may call them so) that you hold in such generous esteem, to which I cannot help adverting. I cannot help expressing the delight, the more than happiness it was to me to find so strong an interest awakened on this side of the water, in favour of that little heroine of mine, to whom your president has made allusion, who died in her youth. I had letters about that child, in England, from the dwellers in log-houses among the morasses, and swamps, and densest forests, and deep solitudes of the Far West. Many a sturdy hand, hard with the axe and spade, and browned by the summer's sun, has taken up the pen, and written to me a little history of domestic joy or sorrow, always coupled, I am proud to say, with something of interest in that little tale, or some comfort or happiness derived from it, and my correspondent has always addressed me, not as a writer of books for sale, resident some four or five thousand miles away, but as a friend to whom he might freely impart the joys and sorrows of his own fireside. Many a mother—I could reckon them now by dozens, not by units—has done the like, and has told me how she lost such a child at such a time, and where she lay buried, and how good she was, and how, in this or that respect, she resembles Nell. I do assure you that no circumstance of my life has given me one hundredth part of the gratification I have derived from this source. I was wavering at the time whether or not to wind up my clock,* and come and see this country, and this decided me. I felt as if it were a positive duty, as if I were bound to pack up my clothes, and come and see my friends; and even now I have such an odd sensation in connection with these things, that you have no chance of spoiling me. I feel as though we were agreeing—as indeed we are, if we substitute for fictitious characters the classes from which they are drawn—about third parties, in whom we had a common interest. At every new act of kindness on your part, I say to myself, "That's for Oliver; I should not wonder if that was meant for Smike; I have no doubt that is intended for Nell;" and so I become a much happier, certainly, but a more sober and retiring man than ever I was before.

Gentlemen, talking of my friends in America brings me back, naturally and of course, to you. Coming back to you, and being thereby reminded of the pleasure we have in store in hearing the gentlemen who sit about me, I arrive by the easiest, though not the shortest course in the world, at the end of what I have to say. But before I sit down, there is one topic on which I am desirous to lay particular stress. It has, or should have, a strong interest for us all, since to its literature every country must look for one great means of refining and improving its people, and one great source of national pride and honour. You have in America great writers—great writers—who will live in all time, and are as familiar to our lips as household words. Deriving (as they all do in a greater or less degree, in their several walks) their inspiration from the stupendous country that gave them birth, they diffuse a better knowledge of it, and a higher love for it, all over the civilised world. I take leave to say, in the presence of some of those gentlemen, that I hope the time is not far distant when they, in America, will receive of right some substantial profit and return in England from their labours; and when we in England shall receive some substantial profit and return in America for ours. Pray do not misunderstand me. Securing to myself from day to day the means of an honourable subsistence, I would rather have the affectionate regard of my fellow-men, than I would have heaps and mines of gold. But the two things do not seem to me incompatible. They cannot be, for nothing good is incompatible with justice; there must be an international arrangement in this respect: England has done her part, and I am confident that the time is not far distant when America will do hers. It becomes the character of a great country; firstly, because it is justice; secondly, because without it you never can have, and keep, a literature of your own.

Gentlemen, I thank you with feelings of gratitude, such as are not often awakened, and can never be expressed. As I understand it to be the pleasant custom here to finish with a toast, I would beg to give you, "America and England," and may they never have any division but the Atlantic between them.

[At Hartford, U.S., February 7, 1842.]

GENTLEMEN,—To say that I thank you for the earnest manner in which you have drunk the toast just now so eloquently proposed to you—to say that I give you back your kind wishes and good feelings with more than compound interest; and that I feel how dumb and powerless the best acknowledgments would be beside

* "Master Humphrey's Clock."

such genial hospitality as yours, is nothing. To say that in this winter season, flowers have sprung up in every footstep's length of the path which has brought me here; that no country ever smiled more pleasantly than yours has smiled on me; and that I have rarely looked upon a brighter summer prospect than that which lies before me now, is nothing.

But it is something to be no stranger in a strange place—to feel, sitting at a board for the first time, the ease and affection of an old guest, and to be at once on such intimate terms with the family as to have a homely, genuine interest in its every member—it is, I say, something to be in this novel and happy frame of mind. And, as it is of your creation, and owes its being to you, I have no reluctance in urging it as a reason why, in addressing you, I should not so much consult the form and fashion of my speech, as I should employ that universal language of the heart, which you, and such as you, best teach, and best can understand. Gentlemen, in that universal language—common to you in America, and to us in England, as that younger mother-tongue, which, by the means of, and through the happy union of our two great countries, shall be spoken ages hence, by land and sea, over the wide surface of the globe—I thank you.

I had occasion to say the other night in Boston, as I have more than once had occasion to remark before, that it is not easy for an author to speak of his own books. If the task be a difficult one at any time, its difficulty, certainly, is not diminished when a frequent recurrence to the same theme has left one nothing new to say. Still, I feel that, in a company like this, and especially after what has been said by the president, that I ought not to pass lightly over those labours of love, which, if they had no other merit, have been the happy means of bringing us together.

It has been often observed, that you cannot judge of an author's personal character from his writings. It may be that you cannot. I think it very likely, for many reasons, that you cannot. But, at least, a reader will rise from the perusal of a book with some defined and tangible idea of the writer's moral creed and broad purposes, if he has any at all; and it is probable enough that he may like to have this idea confirmed from the author's lips, or dissipated by his explanation. Gentlemen, my moral creed—which is a very wide and comprehensive one, and includes all sects and parties—is very easily summed up. I have faith, and I wish to diffuse faith in the existence—yes, of beautiful things, even in those conditions of society, which are so degenerate, degraded, and forlorn, that, at first sight, it would seem as though they could not be described but by a strange and terrible reversal of the words of Scripture, "God said, Let there be light, and there was none." I take it that we are born, and that we hold our sympathies, hopes, and energies, in trust for the many, and not for the few. That we cannot hold in too strong a light of disgust and contempt, before the view of others, all meanness, falsehood, cruelty, and oppression, of every grade and kind. Above all, that nothing is high, because it is in a high place; and that nothing is low, because it is in a low one. This is the lesson taught us in the great book of nature. This is the lesson which may be read, alike in the bright track of the stars, and in the dusty course of the poorest thing that drags its tiny length upon the ground. This is the lesson ever uppermost in the thoughts of that inspired man, who tells us that there are

> "Tongues in the trees, books in the running brooks,
> Sermons in stones, and good in everything."

Gentlemen, keeping these objects steadily before me, I am at no loss to refer your favour and your generous hospitality back to the right source. While I know, on the one hand, that if, instead of being what it is, this were a land of tyranny and wrong, I should care very little for your smiles or frowns, so I am sure upon the other, that if, instead of being what I am, I were the greatest genius that ever trod the earth, and had diverted myself for the oppression and degradation of mankind, you would despise and reject me. I hope you will, whenever, through such means, I give you the opportunity. Trust me, that, whenever you give me the like occasion, I will return the compliment with interest.

Gentlemen, as I have no secrets from you, in the spirit of confidence you have engendered between us, and as I have made a kind of compact with myself that I never will, while I remain in America, omit an opportunity of referring to a topic in which I and all others of my class on both sides of the water are equally interested—equally interested, there is no difference between us, I would beg leave to whisper in your ear two words: *International Copyright.* I use them in no sordid sense, believe me, and those who know me best, best know that. For myself, I would rather that my children, coming after me, trudged in the mud, and knew by the general feeling of society that their father was beloved, and had been of some use, than I would have them ride in their carriages, and know by their bankers' books that he was rich. But I do not see, I confess, why one should be obliged to make the choice, or why fame, besides playing that delightful *reveil* for which she is so justly celebrated, should not blow out of her trumpet a few notes of a different kind from those with which she has hitherto contented herself.

It was well observed the other night by a beautiful speaker, whose words went to the heart of every man who heard him, that, if there had existed any law in this respect, Scott might not have sunk beneath the mighty pressure on his brain, but might have lived to

add new creatures of his fancy to the crowd which swarm about you in your summer walks, and gather round your winter evening hearths.

As I listened to his words, there came back, fresh upon me, that touching scene in the great man's life, when he lay upon his couch, surrounded by his family, and listened, for the last time, to the rippling of the river he had so well loved, over its stony bed. I pictured him to myself, faint, wan, dying, crushed both in mind and body by his honourable struggle, and hovering round him the phantoms of his own imagination—Waverley, Ravenswood, Jeanie Deans, Rob Roy, Caleb Balderstone, Dominie Sampson—all the familiar throng—with cavaliers, and Puritans, and Highland chiefs innumerable overflowing the chamber, and fading away in the dim distance beyond. I pictured them, fresh from traversing the world, and hanging down their heads in shame and sorrow, that, from all those lands into which they had carried gladness, instruction, and delight for millions, they brought him not one friendly hand to help to raise him from that sad, sad bed. No, nor brought him from that land in which his own language was spoken, and in every house and hut of which his own books were read in his own tongue, one grateful dollar piece to buy a garland for his grave. Oh! if every man who goes from here, as many do, to look upon that tomb in Dryburgh Abbey, would but remember this, and bring the recollection home!

Gentlemen, I thank you again, and once again, and many times to that. You have given me a new reason for remembering this day, which is already one of mark in my calendar, it being my birthday; and you have given those who are nearest and dearest to me a new reason for recollecting it with pride and interest. Heaven knows that, although I should grow ever so grey, I shall need nothing to remind me of this epoch in my life. But I am glad to think that from this time you are inseparably connected with every recurrence of this day; and, that on its periodical return, I shall always, in imagination, have the unfading pleasure of entertaining you as my guests, in return for the gratification you have afforded me to-night.

[Reply to a toast at a dinner given in New York, February 18, 1842: Washington Irving in the chair.]

GENTLEMEN,—I don't know how to thank you—I really don't know how. You would naturally suppose that my former experience would have given me this power, and that the difficulties in my way would have been diminished; but I assure you the fact is exactly the reverse, and I have completely baulked the ancient proverb that "a rolling stone gathers no moss;" and in my progress to this city I have collected such a weight of obligations and acknowledgment—I have picked up such an enormous mass of fresh moss at every point, and was so struck by the brilliant scenes of Monday night, that I thought I could never by any possibility grow any bigger. I have made, continually, new accumulations to such an extent that I am compelled to stand still, and can roll no more!

Gentlemen, we learn from the authorities, that, when fairy stones, or balls, or rolls of thread, stopped of their own accord—as I do not—it presaged some great catastrophe near at hand. The precedent holds good in this case. When I have remembered the short time I have before me to spend in this land of mighty interests, and the poor opportunity I can at best have of acquiring a knowledge of, and forming an acquaintance with it, I have felt it almost a duty to decline the honours you so generously heap upon me, and pass more quietly among you. For Argus himself, though he had but one mouth for his hundred eyes, would have found the reception of a public entertainment once a week too much for his greatest activity; and, as I would lose no scrap of the rich instruction and the delightful knowledge which meet me on every hand (and already I have gleaned a great deal from your hospitals and common jails)—I have resolved to take up my staff, and go my way rejoicing, and for the future to shake hands with America, not at parties but at home; and, therefore, gentlemen, I say to-night, with a full heart, and an honest purpose, and grateful feelings, that I bear, and shall ever bear, a deep sense of your kind, your affectionate and your noble greeting, which it is utterly impossible to convey in words. No European sky without, and no cheerful home or well-warmed room within, shall ever shut out this land from my vision. I shall often hear your words of welcome in my quiet room, and oftenest when most quiet; and shall see your faces in the blazing fire. If I should live to grow old, the scenes of this and other evenings will shine as brightly to my dull eyes fifty years hence as now; and the honours you bestow upon me shall be well remembered and paid back in my undying love, and honest endeavours for the good of my race.

Gentlemen, one other word with reference to this first person singular, and then I shall close. I came here in an open, honest, and confiding spirit, if ever man did, and because I felt a deep sympathy in your land; had I felt otherwise, I should have kept away. As I came here, and *am* here, without the least admixture of one-hundredth part of one grain of base alloy, without one feeling of unworthy reference

to self in any respect, I claim, in regard to the past, for the last time, my right in reason, in truth, and in justice, to approach, as I have done on two former occasions, a question of literary interest. I claim that justice be done; and I prefer this claim as one who has a right to speak and be heard. I have only to add that I shall be as true to you as you have been to me. I recognise in your enthusiastic approval of the creatures of my fancy, your enlightened care for the happiness of the many, your tender regard for the afflicted, your sympathy for the downcast, your plans for correcting and improving the bad, and for encouraging the good; and to advance these great objects shall be, to the end of my life, my earnest endeavour, to the extent of my humble ability. Having said thus much with reference to myself, I shall have the pleasure of saying a few words with reference to somebody else.

There is in this city a gentleman who, at the reception of one of my books—I well remember it was the "Old Curiosity Shop"—wrote to me in England a letter so generous, so affectionate, and so manly, that if I had written the book under every circumstance of disappointment, of discouragement, and difficulty, instead of the reverse, I should have found in the receipt of that letter my best and most happy reward. I answered him, and he answered me, and so we kept shaking hands autographically, as if no ocean rolled between us. I came here to this city eager to see him, and [laying his hand upon Irving's shoulder] here he sits! I need not tell you how happy and delighted I am to see him here to-night in this capacity.

Washington Irving! Why, gentlemen, I don't go upstairs to bed two nights out of the seven—as a very creditable witness near at hand can testify—I say I do not go to bed two nights out of the seven without taking Washington Irving under my arm; and, when I don't take him, I take his own brother, Oliver Goldsmith. Washington Irving! Why, of whom but him was I thinking the other day when I came up by the Hog's Back, the Frying Pan, Hell Gate, and all these places? Why, when, not long ago, I visited Shakespeare's birthplace, and went beneath the roof where he first saw light, whose name but *his* was pointed out to me upon the wall? Washington Irving, Diedrich Knickerbocker, Geoffrey Crayon—why, where can you go that they have not been there before? Is there an English farm—is there an English stream, an English city, or an English country-seat, where they have not been? Is there no Bracebridge Hall in existence? Has it no ancient shades or quiet streets?

In bygone times, when Irving left that hall, he left sitting in an old oak chair, in a small parlour of the Boar's Head, a little man with a red nose and an oilskin hat. When I came away he was sitting there still!—not a man *like* him, but the same man—with the nose of immortal redness and the hat of an undying glaze! Crayon, while there, was on terms of intimacy with a certain radical fellow, who used to go about, with a hatful of newspapers, wofully out at elbows, and with a coat of great antiquity. Why, gentlemen, I know that man—Tibbles the elder, and he has not changed a hair; and, when I came away, he charged me to give his best respects to Washington Irving!

Leaving the town and the rustic life of England—forgetting this man, if we can—putting out of mind the country churchyard and the broken heart—let us cross the water again, and ask who has associated himself most closely with the Italian peasantry and the bandits of the Pyrenees? When the traveller enters his little chamber beyond the Alps—listening to the dim echoes of the long passages and spacious corridors—damp, and gloomy, and cold—as he hears the tempest beating with fury against his window, and gazes at the curtains, dark, and heavy, and covered with mould—and when all the ghost stories that ever were told come up before him—amid all his thick-coming fancies, whom does he think of? Washington Irving.

Go further still: go to the Moorish fountains, sparkling full in the moonlight—go among the water-carriers and the village gossips, living still as in days of old—and who has travelled among them before you, and peopled the Alhambra and made eloquent its shadows? Who awakes there a voice from every hill and in every cavern, and bids legends, which for centuries have slept a dreamless sleep, or watched unwinkingly, start up and pass before you in all their life and glory?

But leaving this again, who embarked with Columbus upon his gallant ship, traversed with him the dark and mighty ocean, leaped upon the land and planted there the flag of Spain, but this same man, now sitting by my side? And being here at home again, who is a more fit companion for money-diggers? And what pen but his has made Rip Van Winkle, playing at nine-pins on that thundering afternoon, as much part and parcel of the Catskill Mountains as any tree or crag that they can boast?

But these are topics familiar from my boyhood, and which I am apt to pursue; and lest I should be tempted now to talk too long about them, I will, in conclusion, give you a sentiment, most appropriate, I am sure, in the presence of such writers as Bryant, Halleck, and—but I suppose I must not mention the ladies here—"The Literature of America." She well knows how to do honour to her own literature and to that of other lands, when she chooses Washington Irving for her representative in the country of Cervantes.

[Given at the annual meeting of the Institutional Association of Lancashire and Cheshire, held in the Free-trade Hall, Manchester, December 3, 1858.]

It has of late years become noticeable in England that the autumn season produces an immense amount of public speaking. I notice that no sooner do the leaves begin to fall from the trees, than pearls of great price begin to fall from the lips of the wise men of the east, and north, and west, and south; and anybody may have them by the bushel, for the picking up. Now, whether the comet has this year had a quickening influence on this crop, as it is by some supposed to have had upon the corn harvest and the vintage, I do not know; but I do know that I have never observed the columns of the newspapers to groan so heavily under a pressure of orations, each vying with the other in the two qualities of having little or nothing to do with the matter in hand, and of being always addressed to any audience in the wide world rather than the audience to which it was delivered.

The autumn having gone, and the winter come, I am so sanguine as to hope that we in our proceedings may break through this enchanted circle and deviate from this precedent; the rather as we have something real to do, and are come together, I am sure, in all plain fellowship and straightforwardness, to do it. We have no little straws of our own to throw up to show us which way any wind blows, and we have no oblique biddings of our own to make for anything outside this hall.

At the top of the public announcement of this meeting are the words, "Institutional Association of Lancashire and Cheshire." Will you allow me, in reference to the meaning of those words, to present myself before you as the embodied spirit of ignorance recently enlightened, and to put myself through a short, voluntary examination as to the results of my studies. To begin with: the title did not suggest to me anything in the least like the truth. I have been for some years pretty familiar with the terms, "mechanics' institutions," and "literary societies," but they have, unfortunately, become too often associated in my mind with a body of great pretensions, lame as to some important member or other, which generally inhabits a new house much too large for it, which is seldom paid for, and which takes the name of the mechanics most grievously in vain, for I have usually seen a mechanic and a dodo in that place together.

I, therefore, began my education, in respect of the meaning of this title, very coldly indeed, saying to myself, "Here's the old story." But the perusal of a very few lines of my book soon gave me to understand that it was not by any means the old story; in short, that this association is expressly designed to correct the old story, and to prevent its defects from becoming perpetuated. I learned that this Institutional Association is the union, in one central head, of one hundred and fourteen local mechanics' institutions and mutual improvement societies, at an expense of no more than five shillings to each society; suggesting to all how they can best communicate with and profit by the fountain-head and one another; keeping their best aims steadily before them; advising them how those aims can be best attained; giving a direct end and object to what might otherwise easily become waste forces; and sending among them not only oral teachers, but, better still, boxes of excellent books, called "free itinerating libraries." I learned that these books are constantly making the circuit of hundreds upon hundreds of miles, and are constantly being read with inexpressible relish by thousands upon thousands of toiling people, but that they are never damaged or defaced by one rude hand. These and other like facts lead me to consider the immense importance of the fact, that no little cluster of working-men's cottages can arise in any Lancashire or Cheshire valley, at the foot of any running stream which enterprise hunts out for water-power, but it has its educational friend and companion ready for it, willing for it, acquainted with its thoughts and ways and turns of speech even before it has come into existence.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, this is the main consideration that has brought me here. No central association at a distance could possibly do for those working-men what this local association does. No central association at a distance could possibly understand them as this local association does. No central association at a distance could possibly put them in that familiar and easy communication one with another, as that I, man or boy, eager for knowledge, in that valley seven miles off, should know of you, man or boy, eager for knowledge, in that valley twelve miles off, and should occasionally trudge to meet you, that you may impart your learning in one branch of acquisition to me, whilst I impart mine in another to you. Yet this is distinctly a feature, and a most important feature, of this society.

On the other hand, it is not to be supposed that these honest men, however zealous, could, as a rule, succeed in establishing and maintaining their own institutions of themselves. It is obvious that combination must materially diminish their cost, which is in time a vital consideration; and it is equally obvious that experience, essential to the success of all combination, is especially so when its object is to diffuse the results of experience and of reflection.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, the student of the present profitable history of this society does not stop here in his learning; when he has got so far, he finds with interest and pleasure that the parent society at certain stated periods invites the more eager and enterprising members

of the local society to submit themselves to voluntary examination in various branches of useful knowledge, of which examination it takes the charge and arranges the details, and invites the successful candidates to come to Manchester to receive the prizes and certificates of merit which it impartially awards. The most successful of the competitors in the list of these examinations are now among us, and these little marks of recognition and encouragement I shall have the honour presently of giving them, as they come before you, one by one, for that purpose.

I have looked over a few of those examination papers, which have comprised history, geography, grammar, arithmetic, bookkeeping, decimal coinage, mensuration, mathematics, social economy, the French language—in fact, they comprise all the keys that open all the locks of knowledge. I felt most devoutly gratified, as to many of them, that they had not been submitted to me to answer, for I am perfectly sure that if they had been, I should have had mighty little to bestow upon myself to-night. And yet it is always to be observed and seriously remembered that these examinations are undergone by people whose lives have been passed in a continual fight for bread, and whose whole existence has been a constant wrestle with

> "Those twin gaolers of the daring heart—
> Low birth and iron fortune."

I could not but consider, with extraordinary admiration, that these questions have been replied to, not by men like myself, the business of whose life is with writing and with books, but by men, the business of whose life is with tools and with machinery.

Let me endeavour to recall, as well as my memory will serve me, from among the most interesting cases of prize-holders and certificate-gainers who will appear before you, some two or three of the most conspicuous examples. There are two poor brothers from near Chorley, who work from morning to night in a coal pit, and who, in all weathers, have walked eight miles a night, three nights a week, to attend the classes in which they have gained distinction. There are two poor boys from Bollington, who began life as piecers at one shilling or eighteenpence a week, and the father of one of whom was cut to pieces by the machinery at which he worked, but not before he had himself founded the institution in which this son has since come to be taught. These two poor boys will appear before you to-night, to take the second-class prize in chemistry. There is a plasterer from Bury, sixteen years of age, who took a third-class certificate last year at the hands of Lord Brougham; he is this year again successful in a competition three times as severe. There is a waggon-maker from the same place, who knew little or absolutely nothing until he was a grown man, and who has learned all he knows, which is a great deal, in the local institution. There is a chain-maker, in very humble circumstances, and working hard all day, who walks six miles a night, three nights a week, to attend the classes in which he has won so famous a place. There is a moulder in an iron foundry, who, whilst he was working twelve hours a day before the furnace, got up at four o'clock in the morning to learn drawing. "The thought of my lads," he writes in his modest account of himself, "in their peaceful slumbers above me, gave me fresh courage, and I used to think that if I should never receive any personal benefit, I might instruct them when they came to be of an age to understand the mighty machines and engines which have made our country—England—pre-eminent in the world's history." There is a piecer at mule frames, who could not read at eighteen, who is now a man of little more than thirty, who is the sole support of an aged mother, who is arithmetical teacher in the institution in which he himself was taught, who writes of himself that he made the resolution never to take up a subject without keeping to it, and who has kept to it with such an astonishing will that he is now well versed in Euclid and algebra, and is the best French scholar in Stockport. The drawing classes in that same Stockport are taught by a working blacksmith; and the pupils of that working blacksmith will receive the highest honours of to-night. Well may it be said of that good blacksmith, as it was written of another of his trade, by the American poet:

> "Toiling, rejoicing, sorrowing,
> Onward through life he goes;
> Each morning sees some task begun,
> Each evening sees its close.
> Something attempted, something done,
> Has earned a night's repose."

To pass from the successful candidates to the delegates from local societies now before me, and to content myself with one instance from amongst them. There is among their number a most remarkable man, whose history I have read with feelings that I could not adequately express under any circumstances, and least of all when I know he hears me, who worked when he was a mere baby at hand-loom weaving until he dropped from fatigue: who began to teach himself as soon as he could earn five shillings a week: who is now a botanist, acquainted with every production of the Lancashire valley: who is a naturalist, and has made and preserved a collection of the eggs of British birds, and stuffed the birds: who is now a conchologist, with a very curious, and in some respects an original collection of fresh-water shells, and has also preserved and collected the mosses of fresh water and of the sea: who is worthily the president of his own local literary institution, and who was at his work this time last night as foreman in a mill.

So stimulating has been the influence of these

bright examples, and many more, that I notice among the applications from Blackburn for preliminary test examination papers, one from an applicant who gravely fills up the printed form by describing himself as ten years of age, and who, with equal gravity, describes his occupation as "nursing a little child." Nor are these things confined to the men. The women employed in factories, milliners' work, and domestic service, have begun to show, as it is fitting they should, a most decided determination not to be outdone by the men; and the women of Preston in particular, have so honourably distinguished themselves, and shown in their examination papers such an admirable knowledge of the science of household management and household economy, that if I were a working bachelor of Lancashire or Cheshire, and if I had not cast my eye or set my heart upon any lass in particular, I should positively get up at four o'clock in the morning with the determination of the iron moulder himself, and should go to Preston in search of a wife.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, these instances, and many more, daily occurring, always accumulating, are surely better testimony to the working of this association, than any number of speakers could possibly present to you. Surely the presence among us of these indefatigable people is the association's best and most effective triumph in the present and the past, and is its noblest stimulus to effort in the future. As its temporary mouthpiece, I would beg to say to that portion of the company who attend to receive the prizes, that the institution can never hold itself apart from them—can never set itself above them; that their distinction and success must be its distinction and success; and that there can be but one heart beating between them and it. In particular, I would most especially entreat them to observe that nothing will ever be further from this association's mind than the impertinence of patronage. The prizes that it gives, and the certificates that it gives, are mere admiring assurances of sympathy with so many striving brothers and sisters, and are only valuable for the spirit in which they are given, and in which they are received. The prizes are money prizes, simply because the institution does not presume to doubt that persons who have so well governed themselves, know best how to make a little money serviceable—because it would be a shame to treat them like grown-up babies by laying it out for them, and because it knows it is given, and knows it is taken, in perfect clearness of purpose, perfect trustfulness, and, above all, perfect independence.

Ladies and gentlemen, reverting once more to the whole collective audience before me, I will, in another two minutes, release the hold which your favour has given me on your attention. Of the advantages of knowledge I have said, and I shall say nothing. Of the certainty with which the man who grasps it under difficulties rises in his own respect and in usefulness to the community, I have said, and I shall say nothing. In the city of Manchester, in the county of Lancaster, both of them remarkable for self-taught men, that were superfluous indeed. For the same reason I rigidly abstain from putting together any of the shattered fragments of that poor clay image of a parrot, which was once always saying, without knowing why, or what it meant, that knowledge was a dangerous thing. I should as soon think of piecing together the mutilated remains of any wretched Hindoo who has been blown from an English gun. Both, creatures of the past, have been—as my friend Mr Carlyle vigorously has it—"blasted into space;" and there, as to this world, is an end of them.

So I desire, in conclusion, only to sound two strings. In the first place, let me congratulate you upon the progress which real mutual improvement societies are making at this time in your neighbourhood, through the noble agency of individual employers and their families. whom you can never too much delight to honour. Elsewhere, through the agency of the great railway companies, some of which are bestirring themselves in this matter with a gallantry and generosity deserving of all praise. Secondly and lastly, let me say one word out of my own personal heart, which is always very near to it in this connection. Do not let us, in the midst of the visible objects of nature, whose workings we can tell of in figures, surrounded by machines that can be made to the thousandth part of an inch, acquiring every day knowledge which can be proved upon a slate or demonstrated by a microscope—do not let us, in the laudable pursuit of the facts that surround us, neglect the fancy and the imagination which equally surround us as a part of the great scheme. Let the child have its fables; let the man or woman into which it changes, always remember those fables tenderly. Let numerous graces and ornaments that cannot be weighed and measured, and that seem at first sight idle enough, continue to have their places about us, be we never so wise. The hardest head may co-exist with the softest heart. The union and just balance of those two is always a blessing to the possessor, and always a blessing to mankind. The Divine teacher was as gentle and considerate as He was powerful and wise. You all know how He could still the raging of the sea, and could hush a little child. As the utmost results of the wisdom of men can only be at last to help to raise this earth to that condition to which His doctrine, untainted by the blindnesses and passions of men, would have exalted it long ago; so let us always remember that He set us the example of blending the understanding and the imagination, and that, following it ourselves, we tread in His steps, and help our race on to

its better and best days. Knowledge, as all followers of it must know, has a very limited power indeed, when it informs the head alone; but when it informs the head and the heart too, it has a power over life and death, the body and the soul, and dominates the universe.

NORMAN MACLEOD, D.D.,

1812-1872.

MISSIONS TO INDIA.

I.

[THE conclusion of an address given before the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1868, on his return from India.]

I might use stronger language, and assert that it ought not to be tolerated by any reasonable man, unless proved to be unavoidable, that our several Churches should reproduce, in order to perpetuate in the new world of a Christianised India, those forms and symbols which in the old world have become marks, not of our union as Christians, but of our disunion as sects. We may not, indeed, be responsible for these divisions in the Church which have come down to us from the past. We did not make them, nor can we now, perhaps, unmake them. We find ourselves born into some one of them, and so we accept of it, and make the most of it as the best we can get in the whole circumstances in which we are placed. But must we establish these different organisations in India? Is each part to be made to represent the whole? Is the grand army to remain broken up into separate divisions, each to recruit to its own standard, and to invite the Hindoos to wear our respective uniforms, adopt our respective Shibboleths, learn and repeat our respective war-cries, and even make caste marks of our wounds and scars, which to us are but the sad mementoes of old battles? Or, to drop all metaphors, shall Christian converts in India be necessarily grouped and stereotyped into Episcopal Churches, Presbyterian Churches, Lutheran Churches, Methodist Churches, Baptist Churches, or Independent Churches, and adopt as their respective creeds the Confession of Faith, the Thirty-nine Articles, or some other formula approved of by our forefathers, and the separating sign of some British or American sect? Whether any Church seriously entertains this design I know not, though I suspect it of some, and I feel assured that it will be realised in part, as conversions increase by means of foreign missions, and be at last perpetuated, unless it is now carefully guarded against by every opportunity being watched and taken advantage of to propagate a different idea, and to rear up an independent and all-inclusive native Indian Church. By such a Church I mean one which shall be organised and governed by the natives themselves, as far as possible, independently of us. We could of course claim, as Christians and fellow-subjects, to be recognised as brethren, and to be received among its members, or, if it should so please both parties, serve among its ministers, and rejoice always to be its best friends and generous supporters. In all this we would only have them to do to us as we should feel bound to do to them. Such a Church might, as taught by experience, mould its outward form of government and worship according to its inner wants and outward circumstances, guided by history and by the teaching and spirit of Christianity. Its creed—for no Christian society can exist without some known and professed beliefs—would include those truths which had been confessed by the Catholic Church of Christ since the first; and, as necessary to its very existence as a Church it would recognise the supreme authority of Jesus Christ and His apostles. It would also have, like the whole Church, its Lord's Day for public worship, and the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper. Thus might a new temple be reared on the plains of India unlike perhaps any to be seen in our western lands, yet with all our goodly stones built up in its fabric, and with all our spiritual worship within its walls of the one living and true God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. A Church like this would, from its very nationality, attract many a man who does not wish to be ranked among the adherents of mission Churches. It would dispose, also, of many difficulties inseparable from our position, whether regarding baptism or the selection and support of a native ministry. And, finally, it would give ample scope, for many a year to come, for all the aid and efforts which our home churches and missionaries could afford by schools and colleges, personal labour, and also by money contributions, to establish, strengthen, and extend it.

Moreover, it seems to me that India affords varied and remarkable elements for contributing many varied gifts and talents to such a Church as this. The simple peasant and scholarly pun-

dit, the speculative mystic or self-torturing devotee, the peaceful South-man and the manly North-man; the weak Hindoo who clings to others of his caste for strength, and the strong aborigines who love their individuality and independence—one and all possess a power which could find its place of rest and blessing in the faith of Christ and in fellowship with one another through Him. The incarnate but unseen Christ, the Divine yet human brother, would dethrone every idol; God's Word be substituted for the Puranas; Christian brotherhood for caste; and the peace of God, instead of these and every weary rite and empty ceremony, would satisfy the heart. Such is my ideal, which I hope and believe will one day become real in India. The day, indeed, seems to be far off when "the Church of India," worthy of the country, shall occupy its place within what may then be the Christendom of the world. A period of chaos may intervene ere it is created; and after that, how many days full of change and of strange revolutions, with their "evenings" and "mornings," may succeed, ere it enjoys a Sabbath rest of holiness and peace! But yet that Church must be, if India is ever to become *one*, or a nation in any true sense of the word. For union, strength, and real progress can never henceforth in this world's history either result from or coalesce with Mohammedanism or Hindooism, far less with the cold and heartless abstractions of an atheistic philosophy. Hence English government, by physical force and moral power, *must*, with a firm and unswerving grasp, hold the broken fragments of the Indian races together, until they are united from within by Christianity into a living organism, which can then, and then only, dispense with the force without. The wild olive must be grafted into the "root and fatness" of the good olive-tree of the Church of Christ; and while the living union is being formed, and until the living sap begins to flow from the root to every branch, English power must firmly bind and hold the parts together. Our hopes of an Indian nation are bound up with our hopes of an Indian Church; and it is a high privilege for us to be able to help on this consummation. The West thus gives back to the East the riches which it has from the East received, to be returned again, I doubt not, with interest to ourselves.

But when shall there be a resurrection in this great valley of death? When shall these dry bones live? Lord, Thou knowest, with whom one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day! Let us have faith and patience. There may at first be but a noise and a shaking, and then the bones of the poor broken-up and disjointed skeletons of humanity may come together, and after a while sinews and flesh may cover them, and yet no breath be in them! But these preparatory processes are not in vain. A resurrection-day of life and power will dawn in the fulness of time, and the Lord of Life will raise up prophets, it may be from among the people of India, who will meekly and obediently prophesy as the Lord commands them; and then the glorious result will be witnessed from heaven and earth which we have all prayed and laboured and longed for; the Spirit of Life will come, and these dead bodies will live and stand on their feet, an exceeding great army! "I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb." "Amen: Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honour, and power, and might, be unto our God for ever and ever. Amen."

II.

["When he rose in the Assembly to deliver what proved to be his last speech," writes his brother and biographer, the Rev. Donald Macleod, "he had written nothing beforehand, except a few jottings on the fly-leaf of the mission report; and such was the impassioned and rapid manner in which, under the pressure of his convictions, he grappled with the points he wished most to impress, that the reporters were unable to take down even the meaning of a great part of the address, the most powerful and stirring he ever delivered. . . . Those who were present may retain an impression of its power, but the speech itself has perished."]

There was a sort of feeling of uneasiness and discontent throughout the Church in reference to his conduct of the mission, as if they said, "The mission is excellent; God bless the mission; let us support it; but——" and there was a groan or a sigh, a something he could not get at. It needed no power but that of thoughtlessness to destroy, but they must remember how difficult it is to restore. Any man could set a great building on fire; and a single word, or the shake of the head of a man in authority, might be very destructive to the work of the committee. . . . Did they realise, he asked, what they expected the Hindoos to do, what they blamed them for not doing, or compared these expectations with what they were doing themselves at home? They were asking Hindoos, men of flesh and blood like themselves, and far more sensitive than Scotchmen, of great intelligence and culture, to give up hoary traditions, to cut down the tree of that religion under which they and their fathers had sat for teeming centuries, and to accept the religion of a people whose very touch was pollution! They were asking these men in many cases to give up father and mother, and brother and sister, and were

much astonished they did not make the sacrifice! But suppose the Hindoos, who were observing and intelligent, were to turn on themselves and say, "You are sending us Christianity, to believe which implies enormous sacrifices on our part, but what are your own clergy doing? You are asking us to sacrifice all our traditions, but you won't sacrifice the custom in your parishes that has been brought in by your venerable predecessors! What do you give for the salvation of souls? A pound or a penny, or, as is the case in one hundred and seventy of your churches, nothing at all? You call us deceivers; but we take you by appearances, and ask you to let us see what Christianity is in yourselves before you come to us." . . . He had yet to learn that it was the work of the foreign mission to make converts. He had always understood that the conversion of souls was in the hand of God. He was not speaking lightly of conversion—far from it; but their responsibility as a Church was to use the best means for converting, and to implore God's grace on the means. But he would ask those who judge the mission by the number of converts, to find out how many conversions had taken place in their own parishes during the same time. Let them go down to the village, and entering a house, say they will not leave it till they bring the men and women to Christ. Let them go to the man of science, who had mastered many of the questions of the day; let them not call him proud, or sneer at him as a "natural man," for he may be most earnest, and may be sweating a more bloody sweat in seeking to come to the truth than they had done; let them go to that man and satisfy his doubts, meet him fairly before God, and when they returned from such a visitation as that, they would have more sympathy with missionaries dealing with educated heathens.

["The chief purpose of his speech, however, took wider ground. He desired all Churches to consider whether the forms in which they were presenting truth, and the ecclesiastical differences they were exporting to India, were the best means for Christianising that country. Was it right that the divisions which separated Churches in this country, and which were the growth of their special histories, should not only be continued, but be made as great matters of principle in India as in England or Scotland?"]

When these Hindoos heard an Anglican bishop declare that he did not recognise as belonging to Christ's Church congregations of faithful men holding a pure Gospel and observing the sacraments of the Lord; when they met others who said, "You must accept all these Calvinistic doctrines;" and when the Wesleyans came next and said, "God forbid! don't bring these things in;" and the Baptist came with with his idolatry of sacrament, saying, "You must be a Baptist, you must be dipped again;" and when the Roman Catholic came and said, "You are all wrong together;" is it any wonder that the Hindoo, pressed on every side by different forms of Western Christianity, should say, "Gentlemen, I thank you for the good you have done me, but as I am sore perplexed by you all, take yourselves off, leave me alone with God, then I will be fairly dealt with." It was a positive shame—it was a disgrace—that they should take with them to India the differences that separated them a few yards from their brethren in this country. Is it not monstrous to make the man they ordained on the banks of the Ganges sign the Westminster Confession of the Church of Scotland, or the Deed of Demission and Protest of the Free Church? Was that the wisest, was it the Christian way of dealing with Hindoos? . . . And were they presenting the truth to the native mind in the form best fitted for his requirements? The doctrines of their confessions might be true in themselves, but the Confession was a document closely connected with the historical development and with the metaphysical temperament of the people who had accepted it, and might not be equally suitable for those who had not the same traditions and tendencies. Was it necessary to give these minute and abstract statements to Orientals whose habits of mind and spiritual affinities might lay better hold on other aspects of divine truth, and who might mould a theology for themselves, not less Christian, but which would be Indian, and not English or Scotch? The block of ice, clear and cold, the beautiful product of our northern climes, will at the slightest touch freeze the warm lips of the Hindoo. Why insist that he must take that or nothing? Would it not be better to let the stream flow freely that the Eastern may quench his thirst at will from God's own water of life? Would it not be possible for the Evangelical Churches to drop their peculiarities, and in the unselfishness of the common faith construct a primer or make the Apostles' Creed their symbol, and say: "This is not all you are going to learn, but if you receive this truth and be strong in the faith, we will 'receive you so walking, but not to doubtful disputations; and, if in anything ye be otherwise minded, God will reveal even this unto you?'" And they should make known the truth not only by books but by living men. Send them the missionary. Let him be a man who embodies Christianity; and if he were asked, "What is a Christian?" he could answer, "I am; I know and love Christ, and wish you to know Him and love Him too." That man in his justice, generosity, love, self-sacrifice, would make the Hindoo feel that he had a brother given him by a common Father. Let them prepare the Hindoos to form a Church for themselves. Give them the gunpowder, and they will make their own cannon.

["While advocating these catholic aims, he did not forget that spirit of ecclesiasticism, and those prejudices and bigotries he was offending. He rose into indignant remonstrance as he thought of how India might possibly be sacrificed to the timidity of some of the clergy afraid to speak out their thoughts, or, still worse, to the policy of others who, in the critical position of the Church at home, were cautious not to verify the accusations of latitudinarianism made against her by interested opponents."]

You must take care lest by insisting on the minutiæ of doctrine or government you are not raising a barrier to the advances of Christianity. You must take heed lest things infinitesimally small as compared with the great world, may not be kept so near the eye as to conceal the whole world from you. A man may so wrap a miserable partisan newspaper round his head as to shut out the sun, moon, and stars. You must take care that your Cairns do not stand so near as to shut out Calcutta, and the *Watchword* make you so tremble for petty consequences at home that all India is forgotten by you. I am not speaking for myself alone (he added), for I know how these difficulties press upon many a missionary—and remember how more than one has taken my hand, and said we dare not speak out on these things, lest our own names be blasted, ourselves represented as unsafe, and all home-confidence be removed from us. But why should they be afraid of such reproach? Why should I be afraid of it? Am I to be silent lest I should be whispered about, or suspected, or called "dangerous," "broad," "latitudinarian," "atheistic?" So long as I have a good conscience towards God, and have His sun to shine on me, and can hear the birds singing, I can walk across the earth with a joyful and free heart. Let them call me "broad." I desire to be broad as the charity of Almighty God, who maketh His sun to shine on the evil and the good; who hateth no man, and who loveth the poorest Hindoo more than all their committees or all their Churches. But while I long for that breadth of charity, I desire to be narrow—narrow as God's righteousness, which as a sharp sword can separate between eternal right and eternal wrong.

["No one then present can forget the thrilling power, the manly bearing, the intensity of suppressed feeling, with which these words were uttered."]

DEAN STANLEY.

1815-1881.

ST PAUL.

In examining what the character of St Paul was, it is not necessary to go back to the times before his conversion. It was this which was his birthday into the world's history. He might no doubt have been the head of the Pharisaic faction in the last expiring struggles of his nation; he might have rallied round him the nobler spirits of his countrymen, and by his courage and prudence have caused Jerusalem to hold out a few months or years more against the army of Titus. Still at best he would have been a Maccabæus or a Gamaliel, and what a difference to the whole subsequent fortunes of the world between a Maccabæus and a Paul, between the Jewish rabbi and the Apostle of the Gentiles! It was not till the scales fell off from his eyes after the three days' stupor, till the consciousness of his great mission awakened all his dormant energies, that we really see what he was. That Divine Providence (which, as he himself tells us, Gal. i. 15, had "already separated him from his mother's womb") had no doubt overruled the circumstances of his earlier education for the great end to which he was afterwards called; in him, as in similar cases, the natural faculties were by his conversion "not unclothed but clothed upon:" the glory of Divine grace was shown here as always not by repressing and weakening the human character, but by bringing it out for the first time in its full vigour. He was still a Jew; the zeal of his ancestral tribe which had caused him "to raven as a wolf in the morning" of his life, still glowed in his veins when he "returned in the evening to divide the spoil" of the mightier enemy whom he had defeated and bound; and in the unwearied energy and self-devotion, no less than the peculiar intensity of national feeling, which mark his whole life and writings, we discern the qualities which the Jewish people alone of all the nations then existing on the earth could have furnished. But there were other elements which his conversion developed into life besides the mere enthusiasm of the Jew shared equally with him by St Peter. I would not lay stress on the Grecian culture which he might have received in the schools of Tarsus, or the philosophical tone which we know to have characterised the lectures of Gamaliel, though doubtless these had their

share in the formation of his subsequent character. But whatever had been in former ages that remarkable union of qualities which had from the earliest times constituted the chosen people into a link between the East and the West, that was now in the highest degree exemplified in the character of Paul. Never before or since have the Jew and Gentile so completely met in one single person by an absolute though unconscious fusion of the two together; not founding a new system, but breathing a new spirit into that which already existed, and which only needed some such divine impulse to call it into that fulness of life which had been stunted only, not destroyed. He knew nothing, it may be, of those philosophers and historians with whom we are so familiar, nor can we expect to find in him the peculiar graces of Athenian genius; yet it is in the dialectical skill of Aristotle, the impassioned appeals of Demosthenes, the complicated sentences of Thucydides, far more than in the language of Moses or Solomon or Isaiah, that the form and structure of his arguments finds its natural parallel. He had never studied, it may be, or, if he had, would hardly have discerned those finer feelings of humanity of which the germs existed in Greece and Rome, but how remarkably are they exemplified in his own character! What is that probing of the innermost recesses of the human heart and conscience—so unlike the theocratic visions of the older prophets—but the apostolical reflection of the practical, individual, psychological spirit of the western philosophies? What is that inimitable union of self-respect with respect and deference to others which distinguishes his more personal addresses to his converts, but the anticipation of that refined and polished courtesy which has been ever esteemed the peculiar product of European civilisation? What is that capacity for throwing himself into the position and feeling of others—that becoming "all things to all men," which his enemies called worldly prudence—that intense sympathy in the strength of which, as has been truly said, he "had a thousand friends, and loved each as his own soul, and seemed to live a thousand lives in them, and died a thousand deaths when he must quit them," which "suffered when the weaker brother suffered," which would not allow him to eat meat "whilst the world standeth lest he make his brother to offend"—what was all this but the effect of God's blessing on that boundless versatility of nature which had formed the especial mark of the Grecian mind for good and evil in all ages? What was it but the significant maxim of the Roman poet, "Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto," transfigured for the first time in the heavenly radiance of truth and holiness?

It will not be supposed that in this brief view of the outward aspect of St Paul's character I have attempted to give a complete analysis of it. I have purposely confined myself to those natural and moral gifts which, as they were practically called into existence by and for the work which he was to perform, can only through and in that work be fully understood. There is perhaps no feature of the apostolical age which is more difficult for us to comprehend than the immense importance attached by St Paul to so obvious a truth as the admission of the Gentiles into the Christian Church, still more the furious opposition by which its first announcement was met. Yet so it was. Other questions occupied the attention of the first dawn and of the final close of the apostolic age, but the one question above all others which absorbed its mid-day prime—which is the key to almost all the Epistles, which is the one subject of almost the whole history of the Acts—was not the foundation, not the completion of the Christian Church, but its universal diffusion; the destruction, not of paganism, not of Gnosticism, but of Judaism. He therefore who stood at this juncture as the champion of this new truth at once drew the whole attention of the Christian world to himself—every other apostle recedes from our view—east and west, north and south, from Jerusalem to Rome, from Macedonia to Melita, we hear of nothing, we see nothing but St Paul and his opponents.

It is only by bearing this steadily in mind that we can rightly conceive the nature of the conflict. He was not like a missionary of later times whose great work is accomplished if he can add to the number of his converts; he was this, but he was much more than this: it was not the actual conversions themselves, but the principle which every conversion involved; not the actual disciples whom he gained, but he himself who dared to make them disciples, that constitutes the enduring interest of that life-long struggle. It was not merely that he reclaimed from paganism the Grecian cities of Asia Minor, but that at every step which he took westward from Palestine he tore up the prejudices of ages. It was not merely that he cast out the false spirit from the damsel at Philippi, but that when he set his foot on the further shores of the Ægean Sea, religion for the first time ceased to be Asiatic and became European. It was not merely that at Athens he converted Dionysius and Damaris, but that there was seen a Jew standing in the court of the Areopagus, and appealing to an Athenian audience, as children of the same Father, as worshippers, though unconsciously, of the same God. It was not that at Rome he made some impression more or less permanent on the slaves of the imperial palace, but that a descendant of Abraham recognised in the dense masses of that corrupt metropolis a field for his exertions as sacred as in the courts of the Temple of Jerusalem. It was not the Roman governor or the Ephesian mob, but the vast body

of Judaising Christians which was his real enemy; not the worshippers of Jupiter and Diana, but those who made their boast of Moses and claimed to be disciples of Cephas. The conflict with paganism was indeed the occasion of those few invaluable models of missionary preaching which are preserved to us in his speeches; but it is the conflict with Judaism which forms the one continuous subject of that far more elaborate and enduring record of his teaching which is preserved to us in his Epistles. At every step of his progress he is dogged by his implacable adversaries, and at every step, as he turns to resist them, he flings back those words of entreaty, of rebuke, of warning, which have become the treasures of the Christian Church for ever. They deny his authority, they impugn his motives, they raise the watchword of the law and of circumcision, and the result is to be found in the early Epistles to Corinth, to Galatia, and to Rome. They harass him in his imprisonment at Rome, they blend their Jewish notions with the wilder theories of Oriental philosophy, and there rises before him in the Epistles to Ephesus, Colossæ, and Philippi, the majestic vision of the spiritual temple which is to grow out of the ruins of the old, of that Divine head of the whole race of man, before whom all temporary and transient rites, all lower forms of worship and philosophy fade away, in whom in the fulness of time all things were gathered together in one. They rise once more in the Asiatic Churches; all Asia is turned away from him; his own companions have forsaken him; he stands almost alone, under the shadow of impending death. But it is the last effort of a defeated and desperate cause. The victory is already gained, and in the three Epistles to Titus and Timotheus we may consent to recognise the last accents of the aged apostle, now conscious that his contest is over; some forebodings indeed we catch in them of that dark storm which was about to sweep within the next few years over the Christian and Jewish world alike; but their general tone is one of calm repose—the mid-day heat is past away—the shades of evening are beginning to slope—the gleam of a brighter sky is seen beyond—and with the assured conviction that the object of his life was fully accomplished, he might well utter the words, "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

ST JOHN.

The life of St John, at first sight, seems shrouded in an atmosphere of religious awe which we cannot penetrate; in him the earthly seems so completely absorbed into the heavenly —the character, the thoughts, the language of the disciple so lost in that of the Master—that we tremble to draw aside the veil from that Divine friendship; we fear to mix any human motives with a life which seems so especially the work of the Spirit of God. . . .

It was not by fluctuating and irregular impulses like Peter, nor yet by a sudden and abrupt conversion like Paul, that John received his education for the apostleship; there was no sphere of outward activity as in Peter, no vehement struggle as in Paul; in action, while Peter speaks, moves, directs, he follows, silent and retired. It would almost seem as if in St John the still contemplation, the intuitive insight into heavenly things, which form the basis of his character, had been deepened and solemnised by something of that more eastern and primitive feeling to which the records of the Jewish nation lead us back; something of that more simple, universal, child-like spirit, which brooded over the cradle of the human race; which entitled the Mesopotamian patriarch, rather than the Hebrew lawgiver or the Jewish king, to be called "the friend of God;" which fitted the prophet of the Chaldean captivity, rather than the native seers of Samaria or Jerusalem, to be the "man greatly beloved."

The whole sum of John's character must of necessity be contained in the one single fact that he was "the disciple whom Jesus loved." Once understand that from whatever causes no obstacle intervened between him and that one Divine object which from the earliest dawn of youth to the last years of extreme old age was ever impressing itself deeper and deeper into his inmost soul, and his whole work on earth is at once accounted for. Whatever we can conceive of devoted tenderness, of deep affection, of intense admiration for goodness, we must conceive of him who even in the palace of the high priest, and at the foot of the cross, was the inseparable companion of his Lord; whatever we can conceive of a gentleness and holiness ever increasing in depth and purity, that we must conceive of the heart and mind which produced the Gospel and Epistles of St John.

One phase, however, of his character there was, which might at first sight seem inconsistent with what has just been said, but which nevertheless was the aspect of it most familiar to the minds of the earliest Church. It was not as John the Beloved Disciple, but as John the Son of Thunder—not as the apostle who leaned on his Master's breast at supper, but as the apostle who called down fire from heaven, who forbade the man to cast out devils, who claimed with his brother the highest places in the kingdom of heaven—that he was known to the readers of the three first Gospels. But in fact it is in accordance with what has been said, that in such a character the more outward and superficial traits should have attracted attention before the complete perfection of that more inward and silent growth which was alone essential to it; and, alien in some respects as the bursts of fiery passion may be from the usual tenor of St John's

later character, they fully agree with the severity, almost unparalleled in the New Testament, which marks the well-known anathema in his Second Epistle, and the story, which there seems no reason to doubt, of Cerinthus and the bath. It is not surprising that the deep stillness of such a character as this should, like the Oriental sky, break out from time to time into tempests of impassioned vehemence; still less that the character which was to excel all others in its devoted love of good should give indications—in its earlier stages even in excess—of that intense hatred of evil, without which love of good can hardly be said to exist.

It was not till the removal of the first and the second apostle from the scene of their earthly labours that there burst upon the whole civilised world that awful train of calamities, which breaking as it did on Italy, on Asia Minor, and on Palestine, almost simultaneously, though under the most different forms, was regarded alike by Roman, Christian, and Jew, as the manifestation of the visible judgment of God. It was now, if we may trust the testimony alike of internal and external proof, in the interval between the death of Nero and the fall of Jerusalem, when the roll of apostolical epistles seemed to have been finally closed, when every other inspired tongue had been hushed in the grave, that there rose from the lonely rock of Patmos, that solemn voice which mingled with the storm that raged around it, as the dirge of an expiring world; that under the "red and lowering sky," which had at last made itself understood to the sense of the dullest, there rose that awful vision of coming destiny, which has received the expressive name of the Revelation of St John the Divine. . . .

As it is love that pervades our whole conception of the teaching of St John, so also it pervades our whole conception of his character. We see him—it surely is no unwarranted fancy—we see him declining with the declining century; every sense and faculty waxing feebler, but that one divinest faculty of all burning more and more brightly; we see it breathing through every look and gesture; the one animating principle of the atmosphere in which he lives and moves; earth and heaven, the past, the present, and the future, alike echoing to him that dying strain of his latest words, "We love Him because He loved us." And when at last he disappears from our view in the last pages of the Sacred Volume, ecclesiastical tradition still lingers in the close: and in that touching story, not the less impressive because so familiar to us, we see the aged apostle borne in the arms of his disciples into the Ephesian assembly, and there repeating over and over again the same saying, "Little children, love one another;" till, when asked why he said this and nothing else, he replied in those well-known words, fit indeed to be the farewell speech of the Beloved Disciple, "Because this is our Lord's command, and if you fulfil this, nothing else is needed."

Such was the life of St John; the sunset, as I venture to call it, of the apostolic age: not amidst the storms which lowered around the apocalyptic seer, but the exact image of those milder lights and shades which we know so well even in our own native mountains, every object far and near brought out in its due proportions, the harsher features now softly veiled in the descending shadows, and the distant heights lit up with a far more than morning or mid-day glory in the expiring glow of the evening heavens.

THE HOPES OF THEOLOGY.

[From an address to the students of St Andrews, March 16, 1877.]

Lord Macaulay, in his celebrated essay on Ranke's "History of the Popes," maintains, with all the exuberance of logic and rhetoric, the difference between theology and all other sciences is in this respect, that what it was in the days of the patriarch Job, such it must be in the nineteenth century, and to the end of time. No doubt in religion, as in all great subjects of human thought, there is a permanent and unchanging element; but in everything which relates to its form, in much which relates to its substance, the paradox of our great historian is as contrary to fact as it would be crushing to our aspirations if it were true. In the practice of theological controversy it has been too much the custom to make the most of differences and the least of agreements. But in the theological study of the past it has been too much the custom to see only the agreements and not the differences. Look in the face the fact that the faith of each successive epoch of Christendom has varied enormously from the belief of its predecessors. The variations of the Catholic Church, both past and present, have been almost, if not quite, as deep and wide as the variations of Protestantism; and these variations, whilst they show that each form of belief is but an approximation to the truth, and not the whole truth itself, contain the surest indication of vitality in the whole body of religious faith. The conceptions of the relations of man to man, and, still more, of man to God, have been incontestably altered with the growth of centuries. Not to speak of the total extinction of ancient polytheism, and confining ourselves within the limits of the Christian Church, it is one of the most consolatory fruits of theological study to observe the disappearance of whole continents of useless controversies which once distracted the world. What has become of the belief, once absolutely universal in Christendom, that no human being could be saved who had

not passed through the waters of baptism; that even innocent children, if not immersed in the font, were doomed to endless perdition? Or where are the interminable questions respecting the doctrine of predestination or the mode of justification which occupied the middle of the sixteenth and the close of the eighteenth century in Protestant Churches? Into what limbo has passed the terrible conflict between the Burghers and Anti-burghers amongst the now United Presbyterians? What do we now hear of the doctrine of the double procession, or of the light on Mount Tabor, which, in the ninth century and in the fifteenth, filled the mind of Eastern Christendom? These questions for the time occupied in these several Churches the whole horizon of theological thought. They are dead and buried; and for us, standing on their graves, it is idle to say that theology has not changed. It has changed. Religion has survived those changes; and this is the historical pledge that it may, that it will, survive a thousand more. Even the mere removal of what may be called dead matter out of the path of living progress is, of itself, a positive gain. But the signs of the capability of future improvement in religion are more direct than this. No doubt theologians have themselves to thank for the rigid, immutable character which has been ascribed by philosophers to their beliefs. The Jesuit maxim, *Sint ut sunt, aut non sint*, has been too often accepted in all Churches for any Church to complain if they have been taken at their word. But already, as far back as the Reformation, there were indications of a deeper insight—exceptional and quaint, but so expressive as to vindicate for Christianity, even then, the widest range which future discoveries may open before it. In the first confession of John Knox, the reformer had perceived what had been so long concealed from the eyes of the schoolmen and the fathers, that the most positive expressions, even of their own convictions, were not guaranteed from imperfection or mutability; and the entreaty with which that confession is prefaced, contains at once a fine example of true Christian humility and the stimulus to the noblest Christian ambition—"We conjure you that if any man will note in this our confession any article or sentence repugnant to God's Holy Word, that it would please him of his gentleness, and for Christian charity's sake, to admonish us of the same in writing; and we, upon our honour and fidelity, do promise him satisfaction from the Holy Scriptures, or due reformation of that which he shall prove to be amiss." And perhaps even more striking is the like expression in the well-known address of the first pastor of the Pilgrim Fathers before embarking on the great enterprise which was to issue in the foundation of new churches and new commonwealths beyond the Atlantic—"I am verily persuaded that the Lord has more truth yet to come for us—yet to break forth out of His Holy Word. The Lutherans cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw. The Calvinists stick fast where they were lef by that great man of God, who yet saw not all things. Though they were burning and shining lights, yet they penetrated not into the whole counsel of God, but were as willing to embrace further light as that which they first received. I beseech you to remember that it is an article of your Church's covenant, that you be ready to receive whatever truth shall be made known to you from the written Word of God." "Noble words," says the eloquent historian of the Dutch Republic—"words to bear fruit, after centuries shall go by." They are, indeed, the charter of the future glories of Protestant, and perhaps of Roman Christianity. Well did Archbishop Whately, in the course of a change in the constitution of the Church of England, exclaim: "I will not believe that the Reformers locked the door, and threw away the key for ever!" It is in the light of this progressive historical development that the confessions and liturgies, doctrines and usages of former times find their proper place. All of them, taken as the final expressions of absolute truth, are misleading. All of them, even the most imperfect, may be taken as the various phases and steps of a Church and a faith whose glory it is to be perpetually advancing towards perfection.

F. W. ROBERTSON.

1816-1853.

THE SYMPATHY OF CHRIST.*

TILL we have reflected on it, we are scarcely aware how much the sum of human happiness in the world is indebted to this one feeling, sympathy. We get cheerfulness and vigour, we scarcely know how or when, from mere association with our fellow-men; and from the looks reflected on us of gladness and employment, we catch inspiration and power to go on from human presence and from cheerful looks. The workman

* The above and the following by kind permission of Messrs H. S. King & Co.

works with added energy from having others by. The full family circle has a strength and a life peculiarly its own. The substantial good and the effectual relief which men extend to one another is trifling. It is not by these, but by something far less costly, that the work is done. God has ensured it by a much more simple machinery. He has given to the weakest and the poorest power to contribute largely to the common stock of gladness. The child's smile and laugh are mighty powers in this world. When bereavement has left you desolate, what substantial benefit is there which makes condolence acceptable? It cannot replace the loved ones you have lost. It can bestow upon you nothing permanent. But a warm hand has touched yours, and its thrill told you that there was a living response there to your emotion. One look—one human sigh has done more for you than the costliest present could convey. And it is for want of remarking this that the effect of public charity falls often so far short of the expectations of those who give. The springs of men's generosity are dried up by hearing of the repining, and the envy, and the discontent which have been sown by the general collection and the provision establishment, among cottages where all was harmony before. The famine and the pestilence are met by abundant liberality; and the apparent return for this is riot and sedition. But the secret lies all in this. It is not in channels such as these that the heart's gratitude can flow. Love is not bought by money, but by love. There has been all the machinery of a public distribution; but there has been no exhibition of individual personal interest. The rich man who goes to his poor brother's cottage, and without affection of humility, naturally, and with the respect which man owes to man, enters into his circumstances, inquiring about his distresses, and hears his homely tale, has done more to establish an interchange of kindly feeling, than he could have secured by the costliest present by itself. Public donations have their value and their uses. Poor laws keep human beings from starvation; but in the point of eliciting gratitude all these fail. Man has not been brought into contact close enough with man for this. They do not work by sympathy.

Again, when the electric touch of sympathetic feeling has gone among a mass of men, it communicates itself, and is reflected back from every individual in the crowd with a force exactly proportioned to their numbers. The speech or sermon read before the limited circle of a family, and the same discourse uttered before closely-crowded hundreds, are two different things. There is a strange power even in the mere presence of a common crowd, exciting almost uncontrollable emotion.

It is on record that the hard heart of an Oriental conqueror was unmanned by the sight of a dense mass of living millions engaged in one enterprise. He accounted for it by saying that it suggested to him that within a single century not one of these millions would be alive. But the hard-hearted bosom of the tyrant mistook its own emotions; his tears came from no such far-fetched inferences of reflection; they rose spontaneously, as they will rise in a dense crowd, you cannot tell why. It is the thrilling thought of numbers engaged in the same object. It is the idea of our own feelings reciprocated back to us, and reflected from many hearts. It is the mighty presence of life.

And again, it seems partly to avail itself of this tendency within us, that such stress is laid on the injunction of invited prayer. Private devotion is essential to the spiritual life—without it there is no life. But it cannot replace united prayer, for the two things have different aims. Solitary prayer is feeble in comparison with that which rises before the throne echoed by the hearts of hundreds, and strengthened by the feeling that other aspirations are mingling with our own. And whether it be the chanted litany, or the more simply read service, or the anthem producing one emotion at the same moment in many bosoms, the value and the power of public prayer seem chiefly to depend on the mysterious affection of our nature-sympathy.

And now, having endeavoured to illustrate this power of sympathy, it is for us to remember that of this in its fulness He is susceptible. There is a vague way of speaking of the atonement which does not realise the tender, affectionate, personal love, by which that daily, hourly reconciliation is effected. The sympathy of Christ was not merely love of men in masses. He loved the masses, but He loved them because made up of individuals. He "had compassion on the multitude;" but He had also discriminating, special tenderness for erring Peter and erring Thomas. He felt for the despised, lonely Zaccheus in his sycamore tree. He compassionated the discomfort of His disciples. He mixed His tears with the stifled sobs by the grave of Lazarus. He called the abashed children to His side. Amongst the numbers as He walked He detected the individual touch of faith. "Master, the multitude throng thee, and sayest Thou, *who* touched me?" "Somebody hath touched me."

Observe how He is touched by our infirmities, with a separate, special, discriminating love. There is not a single throb, in a single human bosom, that does not thrill at once with more than electric speed up to the mighty heart of God. You have not shed a tear or sighed a sigh that did not come back to you exalted and purified by having passed through the eternal bosom.

The priestly powers conveyed by this faculty of sympathising according to the text are two—the power of mercy, and the power of having grace to help. "Therefore," because He can be touched, "let us come boldly," expecting mercy and grace

(1.) We may boldly expect mercy from Him who has learned to sympathise. He learned sympathy by being tempted; but it is by being tempted, yet without sin, that He is specially able to show mercy.

There are two who are unfit for showing mercy—he who has never been tried, and he who having been tempted has fallen under temptation. The young, untempted, and upright, are often severe judges. They are for sanguinary punishment. They are for expelling offenders from the bosom of society. The old, on the contrary, who have fallen much, are lenient; but it is leniency which often talks thus: Men must be men—a young man must sow his wild oats and reform. So young, ardent Saul, untried by doubt, persecuted the Christians with severity; and Saul the king, on the contrary, having fallen himself, weakly permitted Agag to escape punishment. David, again, when his own sin was narrated to him under another name, was unrelenting in his indignation: The man that hath done this shall surely die. None of these were qualified for showing mercy aright. Now this qualification without sin is very remarkable, for it is the one we often least should think of. Unthinkingly we should say, that to have such would make a man lenient; it is not so.

That truth is taught with deep significance in one of the incidents of the Redeemer's life. There stood in His presence a tempted woman covered with the confusion of recent conviction. And there stood beside her the sanctimonious religionists of that day, waiting like hell-hounds to be let loose upon their prey. Calm words came from the lips of Him "who spake as man never spake, and whose heart felt as man never felt. He that is without sin among you let him first cast a stone." A memorable lesson of eternal truth. Sinners are not fit to judge of sin—their justice is revenge, their mercy is feebleness. He alone can judge of sin—he alone can attemper the sense of what is due to offended law, with the remembrance of that which is due to human frailty—he alone is fit for showing manly mercy, who has, like his Master, felt the power of temptation in its might, and comes scathless through the trial. In all points tempted, yet without sin; therefore to Him you may boldly go to find mercy.

(2.) The other priestly power is the grace of showing help in time of need.

We must not make too much of sympathy as mere feeling. We do in things spiritual as we do with hothouse plants. The feeble exotic, beautiful to look at, but useless, has costly sums spent on it. The hardy oak, a nation's strength, is permitted to grow, scarcely observed, in the fence and copses. We prize feeling, and praise its possessor. But feeling is only a sickly exotic in itself, a passive quality having in it nothing moral, no temptation, and no victory. A man is no more a good man for having feeling than he is for having a delicate ear for music, or a far-seeing optic nerve. The Son of Man had feeling. He could be touched. The tear would start from His eyes at the sight of human sorrow. But that sympathy was not exotic in His soul, beautiful to look at, too delicate for use. Feeling with Him led to this—"He went about doing good." Sympathy with Him was this—"Grace to help in time of need." And this is the blessing of the thought of Divine sympathy. By the sympathy of man, after all, the wound is not healed; it is only stanched for a time. It can make the tear flow less bitterly; it cannot dry it up. So far as permanent good goes, who has not felt the deep truth which Job taught his friends—"Miserable comforters are ye all?"

The sympathy of the Divine Human! He knows what strength is needed. He gives grace to help; and when the world with its thousand forms of temptation seems to whisper to us as to Esau, "Sell me thy birthright," the other voice speaks, "Shall I barter blessedness for happiness, the inward peace for the outward thrill, the benediction of my father for a mess of pottage?" There are moments when we seem to tread above this earth superior to its allurements—able to do without its kindness—firmly bracing ourselves to do our work as He did His. These moments are not the sunshine of life. They did not come when the world would have said that all around you was glad; but it was when outward trials had shaken the soul to its very centre, then there came from Him "grace to help in time of need."

From the subject I draw in concluding two inferences. He who would sympathise must be content to be tried and tempted. There is a hard and boisterous rudeness in our hearts by nature, which requires to be softened down. We pass by suffering gaily, carelessly, not in cruelty, but unfeelingly, just because we do not know what suffering is. We wound men by our looks and our abrupt expressions without intending it, because we have not been taught the delicacy and the tact and the gentleness which can only be learned by the wounding of our own sensibilities. There is a haughty feeling in uprightness which has never been on the verge of fall that requires humbling. There is an inability to enter into difficulties of thought which marks the mind to which all things have been presented superficially, and which has never experienced the horror of feeling the ice of doubt crushing beneath the feet.

Therefore, if you aspire to be a son of consolation—if you would partake of the priestly gift of sympathy—if you would pour something beyond commonplace consolation into a tempted heart—if you would pass through the intercourse of daily life, with the delicate tact which never inflicts pain—if to that most acute of human ailments, mental doubt, you are ever to give

effectual succour, you must be content to pay the price of the costly education. Like Him you must suffer, being tempted.

But remember, it is being tempted in all points, *yet without* sin, that makes sympathy real, manly, perfect, instead of a mere sentimental tenderness. Sin will teach you to *feel* for trials. It will not enable you to judge of them, to be merciful to them, nor to help them in time of need with any certainty.

Lastly, it is this same human sympathy which qualifies Christ for judgment. It is written, that the Father hath committed all judgment to Him, *because* He is the Son of Man. The sympathy of Christ extends to the frailties of human nature, not to its hardened guilt. He is "touched with the feeling of our *infirmities*." There is nothing in His bosom which can harmonise with malice. He cannot feel for envy; He has no fellow-feeling for cruelty, oppression, hypocrisy, bitter censorious judgments. Remember, He could look round about Him with anger. The sympathy of Christ is a comforting subject; it is besides a tremendous subject. On sympathy the awards of heaven and hell are built. "Except a man be born again," not he *shall* not, but "he *cannot* enter into heaven." There is nothing in Him which has affinity to anything in the judge's bosom. A sympathy for that which is pure implies a repulsion for that which is impure. Hatred of evil is in proportion to the strength of love for good. To love good intensely is to hate evil intensely. It was in strict accordance with the laws of sympathy that He blighted Pharisaism in such ungentle words as these: "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Win the mind of Christ now, or else His sympathy for human nature will not save you from, but only ensure the recoil of abhorrence at the last, "Depart from me! I never knew you."

WORDSWORTH.

The first qualification I shall speak of as necessary for appreciating poetry is unworldliness. Let us understand the term employed. By worldliness, I mean entanglement in the temporal and visible. It is the spirit of worldliness which makes a man love show, splendour, rank, title, and sensual enjoyments; and occupies his attention, chiefly or entirely, with conversations respecting merely passing events, and passing acquaintances. I know not that I could give a more distinct idea of what I mean by unworldliness, than by relating an anecdote of a boy of rare genius, inheriting genius from both parents, who, when he began the study of mathematics, was impressed with so strange and solemn a sense of awe that never before, he said, had he been able to comprehend the existence of the eternal. It is not difficult to understand what the boy meant. Mathematics contain truths entirely independent of time and space; they tell of relations which have no connection, necessarily, with weight or quality; they deal with the eternal principles and laws of the mind; and it is certain that these laws are more real and eternal than anything which can be seen or felt. This is what I mean by unworldliness: I am not speaking of it as a theologian, or as a religionist, but I am speaking of unworldliness in that sense, of which it is true of all science and high art, as well as of nature. For all high art is essentially unworldliness, and the highest artists have been unworldly in aim, and unworldly in life. . . .

I will give two or three illustrations of the way in which Wordsworth himself looked on this subject. The first is in reference to the power which there is in splendour and in riches to unfit the mind for the contemplation of invisible and spiritual truths. The sonnet I am about to read was written in September 1802, the period during which the chief part of the poems I shall read this evening were written. I believe it was written to Coleridge.

> "Oh! friend, I know not which way I must look
> For comfort, being, as I am, opprest
> To think that now our life is only drest
> For show; mean handy-work of craftsman, cook,
> Or groom!—We must run glittering like a brook
> In the open sunshine, or we are unblest:
> The wealthiest man among us is the best:
> No grandeur now in nature or in book
> Delights us."

The connection of these two things is what I wish to fasten your attention upon:

> "The wealthiest man among us is the best,"

that being the spirit of society; then—

> "No grandeur now in nature or in book
> Delights us."

The second illustration is in reference to what is called scandal or gossip. According to Wordsworth, this is the highest manifestation of a worldly spirit. What is it but conversations respecting passing events or passing acquaintances, unappreciated and unelevated by high principle? Wordsworth has written four sonnets, worthy of deep study, on this subject. After stating the matter in the first of these, in the second he supposes a possible defence against this habit of general conversation respecting others, derisively.

> "'Yet life,' you say, 'is life; we have seen and see,
> And with a lively pleasure we describe;
> And fits of sprightly malice do but bribe
> The languid mind into activity.
> Sound sense, and love itself, and mirth and glee,
> Are fostered by the comment and the gibe.'"

Then comes Wordsworth's comment:

> "Even be it so; yet still among your tribe,
> Our daily world's true worldlings, rank not me!
> Children are blest and powerful; their world lies
> More justly balanced; partly at their feet

And part afar from them: sweetest melodies
Are those that are by distance made more sweet.
Whose mind is but the mind of his own eyes,
He is a slave; the meanest we can meet!"

To understand this, you must carry in your recollection what Wordsworth's views of childhood and infancy are, as given in the sublime "Ode to Immortality." A child, according to Wordsworth, is a being haunted for ever by eternal mind. He tells us that "heaven lies about us in our infancy"—that the child moves perpetually in two worlds: the world that is seen right before him, and that terminated in another world—a world invisible, the glory of which is as from a palace—"that imperial palace whence he came;" and that high philosophy and poetry are nothing but this coming back to the simple state of childhood, in which we see not merely the thing before us, but the thing before us transfigured and irradiated by the perception of that higher life.

"Children are blest and powerful; their world lies
More justly balanced; partly at their feet,
And part afar from them."

Then Wordsworth goes on to show how poetry supplies the place which scandal and gossip had occupied.

"Dreams, books, are each a world; and books, we know,
Are a substantial world, both pure and good:
Round these, with tendrils strong as flesh and blood,
Our pastime and our happiness will grow.
There find I personal themes, a plenteous store,
Matter wherein right voluble I am,
To which I listen with a ready ear;
Two shall be named, pre-eminently dear—
The gentle lady married to the Moor;
And heavenly Una with her milk-white lamb."

In other words, scandal is nothing more than inverted love of humanity. An absolute necessity, Wordsworth tells us, exists within us for personal themes of conversation that have reference to human beings, and not to abstract principles; but when that necessity is gratified upon the concerns and occupations of those immediately around us, which necessarily become mixed with envy and evil feelings, then that necessity is inverted and perverted. So the place of detraction or scandal is by the poet occupied in personal themes; as, for example, when a man has made the object of his household thoughts such characters as Desdemona and Spenser's Una, then he has something which may carry his mind to high and true principles, beyond the present. Then Wordsworth goes on to say:

"Nor can I not believe but that hereby
Great gains are mine; for thus I live remote
From evil speaking; rancour, never sought,
Comes to me not, malignant truth, nor lie.
Hence have I genial seasons, hence have I
Smooth passions, smooth discourse, and joyous thought:
And thus, from day to day my little boat
Rocks in its harbour, lodging peaceably.
Blessings be with them—and eternal praise,
Who gave us nobler loves, and nobler cares—
The poets, who on earth have made us heirs
Of truth and pure delight by heavenly lays."

The second qualification I shall name for the appreciation of poetry is, feelings trained and disciplined by the truth of nature. Let us understand this matter. Poetry represents things, not as they are, but as they seem; and herein it coincides with all high art, for the difference between science and poetry is this—that science and philosophy endeavour to give to us things as they are, art and poetry represent to us things as they seem. Let us take a simple illustration. The painter represents his distant mountains blue, he gives us the distant circle in the oval of perspective, not because they are so, but because they seem so. . . .

And just as the real standard is not the standard of the mass—is not judged by the majority of votes, but is decided by the few—so, in matters of poetry, it is not by the mass or by the majority of votes that these things can be tested; but they are to be tested by the pure, and simple, and true in heart—by those who, all their life long, have been occupied in the discipline of feeling: for in early life poetry is a love, a passion; we care not for quality, we care only for quantity; the majesty and pomp of diction delight us; we love the mere mellifluous flow of the rhyme: and this any one will understand who has heard the boy in the playground spouting, in schoolboy phraseology, his sonorous verses. And so, as life goes on, this passion passes; the love for poetry wanes, the mystic joy dies with our childhood, and other and more real objects in life and business occupy our attention. After twenty a man no longer loves poetry passionately, and at fifty or sixty, if you apply to a man for his judgment, you will find it to be that which was his when a boy. The thirty years that have intervened have been spent in undisciplined feeling, and the taste of the boy is still that of the man—imperfect and undisciplined. . . .

And here lies the great difficulty, the peculiar difficulty of our age; that it is an age of cant without love, of criticism without reverence. You read the magazines, and the quarterlies, and the daily newspapers; you see some slashing article, and after you have perused that article, in which the claims of some great writer have been discussed cursorily and superficially, you take it for granted that you understand, and can form a judgment upon the matter; and yet, all the while, very likely that article has been written by some clever, flippant young man, to whom, for his own misfortune, and for the misfortune of the public, the literary department has been committed. What we want is the old spirit of our forefathers; the firm conviction that not by criticism, but by sympathy, we must

understand: what we want is more reverence, more love, more humanity, more depth.

The third qualification I shall name for an appreciation of poetry is, a certain delicacy and depth of feeling, I do not say that this is necessary for all poets—nay, even for some of the highest it is not necessary; for the epic poet appeals to all minds, he describes things which are applicable to all; the dramatic poet appeals to all, because, although unquestionably some of his characters move in an atmosphere that is unintelligible to the mass, yet in the multiplicity of characters he produces there must be a majority that are intelligible to all; the poet of passion appeals to all, because passions are common to us all. It does not require, for example, much delicacy or profoundness to understand and feel the writings of Anacreon Moore; but there are poets who give us truths which none can appreciate but those who have been engaged in watching faithfully the order in which feelings succeed each other, the successions of our inner life, the way in which things appear in this world when presented to our mind in our highest state. No man needs this discipline and preparation more than the student of Wordsworth, for he gives to us the subtle and pure and delicate and refined succession of human feelings, of which the mind is scarcely conscious, except at the moment when the figure is before us, and we are listening with stilled breath to the mysterious march of our inner life. . . .

I quote one passage in which the poet describes the consecrating effects of early dawn:

"What soul was his when from the naked top
Of some bold headland he beheld the sun
Rise up and bathe the world in light! He looked—
Ocean and earth, the solid frame of earth
And ocean's liquid mass, beneath him lay
In gladness and deep joy. The clouds were touched,
And in their silent faces did he read
Unutterable love. Sound needed none,
Nor any voice of joy; his spirit drank
The spectacle; sensation, soul, and form
All melted into him; they swallowed up
His animal being; in them did he live
And by them did he live; they were his life.
In such access of mind, in such high hour
Of visitation from the living God,
Thought was not; in enjoyment it expired;
No thanks he breathed, he proffered no request;
Rapt into still communion that transcends
The imperfect offices of prayer and praise,
His mind was a thanksgiving to the Power
That made him; it was blessedness and love!"

There is nothing in these lines except we have the heart to feel them. No man can understand or feel those lines who has led a slothful life, or who has not at one time or other loved to rise early—no man who, in his early walks, has not mingled with a love of poetry a deep religious sense, who has not felt the consecrating effects of early dawn, or who has not at one time or another, in his early days, in a moment of deep enthusiasm, knelt down amidst the glories of nature, as the ancient patriarch knelt, canopied only by the sky above him, and feeling that none were awake but the Creator and himself—bowed down to consecrate and offer up the whole of his life, experiencing also a strange, and awful, and mysterious feeling, as if a Hand invisible was laid upon his brow, accepting the consecration and the sacrifice. . . .

In reading Wordsworth the sensation is as the sensation of the pure water-drinker, whose palate is so refined that he can distinguish between rill and rill, river and river. . . . It is like listening to the mysterious music in the conch sea-shell, which is so delicate and refined that we are uncertain whether it is the music and sound of the shell, or merely the pulses throbbing in our own ear; it is like watching the quivering rays of fleeting light that shoot up to heaven as we are looking at the sunset; so fine, so exquisitely touching is the sense of feeling, that we doubt whether it is reality we are gazing upon at all, or whether it is not merely an image created by the power and the trembling of our own inner imagination.

J. B. GOUGH

1817-1886.

THE CAUSE OF TEMPERANCE.

OUR enterprise is in advance of the public sentiment, and those who carry it on are glorious iconoclasts, who are going to break down the drunken Dagon worshipped by their fathers. Count me over the chosen heroes of this earth, and I will show you men that stood alone—ay, alone, while those they toiled, and laboured, and agonised for, hurled at them contumely, scorn, and contempt. They stood alone; they looked into the future, calmly and with faith; they saw the golden beam inclining to the side of perfect justice; and they fought on amidst the storm of persecution. In Great Britain they tell me when I go to see such a prison: "There is a dungeon in which such-a-one was confined;" here, among the ruins of an old castle, they will show me where such-a-one had his ears cut off, and where another was murdered. Then they

will show me monuments towering up to the heavens: "There is a monument to such-a-one; there is a monument to another." And what do I find? That the one generation persecuted and howled at these men, crying, "Crucify them! crucify them!" and dancing round the blazing faggots that consumed them; and the next generation busied itself in gathering up the scattered ashes of the martyred heroes, and depositing them in the golden urn of a nation's history. Oh, yes! the men that fight for a great enterprise are the men that bear the brunt of the battle, and "He that seeth in secret"—seeth the desire of His children, their steady purpose, their firm self-denial—"will reward them openly," though they may die and see no sign of the triumphs of their enterprise.

Our cause is a progressive one. I read the first constitution of the first temperance society formed in the State of New York in 1809, and one of the by-laws stated: "Any member of this association who shall be convicted of intoxication shall be fined a quarter of a dollar, except such act of intoxication shall take place on the 4th of July, or any other regularly-appointed military muster." We laugh at that now; but it was a serious matter in those days; it was in advance of the public sentiment of the age. The very men that adopted that principle were persecuted; they were hooted and pelted through the streets, the doors of their houses were blackened, their cattle mutilated. The fire of persecution scorched some men so, that they left the work. Others worked on, and God blessed them. Some are living to-day; and I should like to stand where they stand now, and see the mighty enterprise as it rises before them. They worked hard. They lifted the first turf—prepared the bed in which to lay the corner-stone. They laid it amid persecution and storm. They worked under the surface, and then commenced another storm of persecution. Now you see the superstructure—pillar after pillar, tower after tower, column after column, with the capitals emblazoned with "Love, truth, sympathy, and goodwill to men." Old men gaze upon it as it grows up before them. They will not live to see it completed, but they see in faith the crowning copestone set upon it. Meek-eyed women weep as it grows in beauty; children strew the pathway of the workmen with flowers. We do not see its beauty yet—we do not see the magnificence of its superstructure yet—because it is in course of erection. Scaffolding, ropes, ladders, workmen ascending and descending, mar the beauty of the building; but, by-and-by, when the hosts who have laboured shall come up over a thousand battle-fields, waving with bright grain never again to be crushed in the distillery—through vineyards, under trellised vines, with grapes hanging in all their purple glory, never again to be pressed into that which can debase and degrade mankind—when they shall come through orchards, under trees hanging thick with golden, pulpy fruit, never to be turned into that which can injure and debase—when they shall come up to the last distillery and destroy it; to the last stream of liquid death and dry it up; to the last weeping wife and wipe her tears gently away; to the last little child and lift him up to stand where God meant that man should stand; to the last drunkard and nerve him to burst the burning fetters, and make a glorious accompaniment to the song of freedom by the clanking of his broken chains—then, ah! then, will the copestone be set upon it, the scaffolding will fall with a crash, and the building will start in its wondrous beauty before an astonished world. The last poor drunkard shall go into it and find a refuge there; loud shouts of rejoicing shall be heard, and there shall be joy in heaven, when the triumphs of a great enterprise shall usher in the day of the triumphs of the cross of Christ. I believe it; on my soul I believe it. Will you help us? That is the question. We leave it with you. Good-night.

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES.

I ask you, is there not something noble and glorious in the fact of seeking out our brethren, not amid the circle of society in which we move, not looking at our visiting lists to find them, not looking around the pews in our places of worship to see them, not seeking for them among the Young Men's Christian Associations, but seeking for them in the midst of the haunts of vice and misery, making inquiries not only as to the fact of their degradation, but as to our responsibility in reference to that degradation? The most glorious men and women on the face of the earth have sought for their neighbours and their brethren out of their own circle. The poor cobbler in Portsmouth that used to go down upon the wharf to find his neighbours among the wretched, ragged, miserable children, and bribe them with two or three roasted potatoes to come into his little shop, eighteen feet by six, that he might teach them to read and mend their clothes, and cook their food—he was a noble man, and John Pounds was the founder of ragged schools. John Howard found his neighbours in the lazar-houses of Europe; William Wilberforce and his glorious compeers found their neighbours among the negroes among the West India plantations; Elizabeth Fry found her neighbours among the half-mad women of Newgate; and she, the heroine of the nineteenth century, found her neighbours among the bruised, battered soldiers of the Crimea; and many a soldier in the hospitals of Scutari died with his glazed eye fixed with love and reverence on the angel face of Florence Nightingale. These are your noble men and women—these are God's heroes. And when we would bring the matter right down to

our own personal responsibilities, the question arises, and I have asked it many times myself—and there is not probably a benevolent man or a philanthropist in this association but has asked the question—What shall be done to elevate the degraded masses? That is the point—what is doing? Ragged schools—good! with all my heart I say, good! And God bless their patrons! Model lodging-houses—good, as far as they go. But you cannot make a model man by putting him in a model house. You have got to elevate the man to the house, or he will bring the house down to his level. It must be by elevating the man that the work will be done; and the working-classes of this country must elevate themselves. Oh, if we could only inspire them with that! The glory of it! To elevate themselves!

JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, LL.D.

1818- ——.

EDUCATION.

[An address delivered to the students of St Andrews, March 19, 1869.]

My first duty, in the observations which I am about to address to you, is to make my personal acknowledgments on the occasion which has brought me to this place. When we begin our work in this world, we value most the approbation of those older than ourselves. To be regarded favourably by those who have obtained distinction, bids us hope that we too, by-and-by, may come to be distinguished in turn. As we advance in life, we learn the limits of our abilities. Our expectations for the future shrink to modest dimensions. The question with us is no longer what we shall do, but what we have done. We call ourselves to account for the time and talents which we have used or misused, and then it is that the good opinion of those who are coming after us becomes so peculiarly agreeable. If we have been roughly handled by our contemporaries, it flatters our self-conceit to have interested another generation. If we feel that we have before long to pass away, we can dream of a second future for ourselves in the thoughts of those who are about to take their turn upon the stage. Therefore it is that no recognition of efforts of mine which I have ever received has given me so much pleasure as my election by you as your rector, an honour as spontaneously and generously bestowed by you as it was unlooked for, I may say undreamt of, by me.

Many years ago, when I was first studying the history of the Reformation in Scotland, I read a story of a slave in a French galley who was one morning bending wearily over his oar. The day was breaking, and, rising out of the grey waters, a line of cliffs was visible, and the white houses of a town and a church tower. The rower was a man unused to such service, worn with toil and watching, and likely, it was thought, to die. A companion touched him, pointed to the shore, and asked him if he knew it. "Yes," he answered, "I know it well. I see the steeple of that place where God opened my mouth in public to His glory; and I know, how weak soever I now appear, I shall not depart out of this life till my tongue glorify His name in the same place." Gentlemen, that town was St Andrews, that galley slave was John Knox; and we know that he came back and did "glorify God" in this place and others to some purpose.

Well, if anybody had told me, when I was reading about this, that I also should one day come to St Andrews and be called on to address the university, I should have listened with more absolute incredulity than John Knox's comrade listened to that prophecy. Yet, inconceivable as it would then have seemed, the unlikely has become fact. I am addressing the successors of that remote generation of students whom John Knox, at the end of his life, "called round him," in this very university, "and exhorted them," as James Melville tells us, "to know God and stand by the good cause, and use their time well." It will be happy for me if I too can read a few words to you out of the same lesson-book; for to make us know our duty and do it, to make us upright in act and true in thought and word, is the aim of all instruction which deserves the name, the epitome of all purposes for which education exists. Duty changes, truth expands, one age cannot teach another either the details of its obligations or the matter of its knowledge, but the principle of obligation is everlasting. The consciousness of duty, whatever its origin, is to the moral nature of man what life is in the seed-cells of all organised creatures—the condition of its coherence, the elementary force in virtue of which it grows.

Every one admits this in words. Rather it has become a cant nowadays to make a parade of noble intentions. But when we pass beyond the verbal proposition our guides fail us, and we are left in practice to grope our way or guess it as we can. So far as our special occupations

go, there is no uncertainty. Are we traders, mechanics, lawyers, doctors?—we know our work. Our duty is to do it as honestly and as well as we can. When we pass to our larger interests, to those which concern us as men—to what Knox meant "by knowing God and standing by the good cause"—I suppose there has been rarely a time in the history of the world when intelligent people have held more opposite opinions. The Scots to whom Knox was speaking knew well enough. They had their Bibles as the rule of their lives. They had broken down the tyranny of a contemptible superstition. They were growing up into yeomen, farmers, artisans, traders, scholars, or ministers, each with the business of his life clearly marked out before him. Their duty was to walk uprightly by the light of the Ten Commandments, and to fight with soul and body against the high-born scoundreldom and spiritual sorcery which were combining to make them again into slaves. I will read you a description of the leaders of the great party in Scotland against whom the Protestants and Knox were contending. I am not going to quote any fierce old Calvinist who will be set down as a bigot and a liar. My witness is M. Fontenay, brother of the secretary of Mary Stuart, who was residing here on Mary Stuart's business. The persons of whom he was speaking were the so-called Catholic lords; and the occasion was in a letter to herself: "The Sirens," wrote this M. Fontenay, "which bewitch the lords of this country are money and power. If I preach to them of their duty to their sovereign—if I talk to them of honour, of justice, of virtue, of the illustrious actions of their forefathers, and of the example which they should themselves bequeath to their posterity—they think me a fool. They can talk of these things themselves—talk as well as the best philosophers in Europe. But, when it comes to action, they are like the Athenians, who knew what was good, but would not do it. The misfortune of Scotland is that the noble lords will not look beyond the points of their shoes. They care nothing for the future, and less for the past." To free Scotland from the control of an unworthy aristocracy, to bid the dead virtues live again, and plant the eternal rules in the consciences of the people—this, as I understand it, was what Knox was working at, and it was comparatively a simple thing. It was simple, because the difficulty was not to know what to do, but how to do it. It required no special discernment to see into the fitness for government of lords like those described by Fontenay; or to see the difference as a rule of life between the New Testament and a creed that issued in Jesuitism and the massacre of St Bartholomew. The truth was plain as the sun. The thing then wanted was *courage;* courage in common men to risk their persons, to venture the high probability that before the work was done they might have their throats cut, or see their houses burned over their heads. Times are changed; we are still surrounded by temptations, but they no longer appear in the shape of stake and gallows. They come rather as intellectual perplexities, on the largest and gravest questions which concern us as human creatures; perplexities with regard to which self-interest is perpetually tempting us to be false to our real convictions. The best that we can do for one another is to exchange our thoughts freely; and that, after all, is but little. Experience is no more transferable in morals than in art. The drawing-master can direct his pupil generally in the principles of art, he can teach him here and there to avoid familiar stumbling-blocks, but the pupil must himself realise every rule which his master gives him. Action is the real teacher. Instruction does but prevent waste of time or mistakes; and mistakes themselves are often the best teachers of all. In every accomplishment, every mastery of truth, moral, spiritual, or mechanical.

"Necesse est
Multa diu concreta modis inolescere miris:"

our acquirements must grow into us in marvellous ways—marvellous—as anything connected with man has been, is, and will be.

I have but the doubtful advantage, in speaking to you, of a few more years of life; and even whether years bring wisdom or do not bring it is far from certain. The fact of growing older teaches many of us to respect notions which we once believed to be antiquated. Our intellectual joints stiffen, and our fathers' crutches have attractions for us. You must therefore take the remarks that I am going to make at what appears to you their intrinsic value. Stranger as I am to all of you, and in a relation with you which is only transient, I can but offer you some few general conclusions which have forced themselves on me during my own experience, in the hope that you may find them not wholly useless. And as it is desirable to give form to remarks which might otherwise be desultory, I will follow the train of thought suggested by our presence at this place and the purpose which brings you here. You stand on the margin of the great world, into which you are about to be plunged, to sink or swim. You will consider the stock-in-trade, the moral and mental furniture, with which you will start upon your journey. In the first place you are Scots; you come of a fine stock, and much will be expected of you. If we except the Athenians and the Jews, no people so few in number have scored so deep a mark in the world's history as you have done. No people have a juster right to be proud of their blood. I suppose, if any one of you were asked whether he would prefer to be the son of a Scotch peasant or to be the heir of an Indian rajah with twenty lacs of rupees, he would not hesitate about his answer: we should none of us

object to the rupees, but I doubt if the Scot ever breathed who would have sold his birthright for them. Well, then, *Noblesse oblige;* all blood is noble here, and a noble life should go along with it. It is not for nothing that you here and we in England come, both of us, of our respective races; we inherit honourable traditions and memories; we inherit qualities inherent in our bone and blood, which have been earned for us, no thanks to ourselves, by twenty generations of ancestors; our fortunes are now linked together for good and evil, never more to be divided; but when we examine our several contributions to the common stock, the account is more in your favour than ours. More than once you saved English Protestantism; you may have to save it again, for all that I know, at the rate at which our English parsons are now running. You gave us the Stuarts, but you helped us to get rid of them. Even now you are teaching us what, unless we saw it before our eyes, no Englishman would believe to be possible, that a member of Parliament can be elected without bribery. For shrewdness of head, thorough-going completeness, contempt of compromise, and moral backbone, no set of people were ever started into life more generously provided. You did not make these things; it takes many generations to breed high qualities either of mind or body; but you have them; they are a fine capital to commence business with, and, as I said, *Noblesse oblige.*

So much for what you bring with you into the world. And the other part of your equipment is only second in importance to it; I mean your education. There is no occasion to tell a Scotchman to value education. On this, too, you have set us an example which we are beginning to imitate: I only wish our prejudices and jealousies would let us imitate it thoroughly. In the form of your education, whether in the parish school or here at the university, there is little to be desired. It is fair all round to poor and rich alike. You have broken down, or you never permitted to rise, the enormous barrier of expense which makes the highest education in England a privilege of the wealthy. The subject-matter is another thing. Whether the subjects to which, either with you or with us, the precious years of boyhood and youth continue to be given are the best in themselves, whether they should be altered or added to, and if so, in what direction and to what extent, are questions which all the world is busy with. Education is on everybody's lips. Our own great schools and colleges are in the middle of a revolution, which, like most revolutions, means discontent with what we have, and no clear idea of what we would have. You yourselves cannot here have wholly escaped the infection, or if you have, you will not escape it long. The causes are not far to seek. On the one hand there is the immense multiplication of the subjects of knowledge, through the progress of science, and the investigation on all sides into the present and past condition of this planet and its inhabitants; on the other, the equally increased range of occupations among which the working part of mankind are now distributed, and for one or other of which our education is intended to qualify us. It is admitted by every one that we cannot any longer confine ourselves to the learned languages, to the grammar and logic and philosophy which satisfied the seventeenth century. Yet, if we try to pile on the top of these the histories and literatures of our own and other nations, with modern languages and sciences, we accumulate a load of matter which the most ardent and industrious student cannot be expected to cope with.

It may seem presumptuous in a person like myself, unconnected as I have been for many years with any educational body, to obtrude my opinion on these things. Yet outsiders, it is said, sometimes see deeper into a game than those who are engaged in playing it. In everything that we do or mean to do, the first condition of success is that we understand clearly the result which we desire to produce. The house-builder does not gather together a mass of bricks and timber and mortar, and trust that somehow a house will shape itself out of its materials. Wheels, springs, screws, and dial-plate, will not constitute a watch, unless they are shaped and fitted with the proper relations to one another. I have long thought that, to educate successfully, you should first ascertain clearly, with sharp and distinct outline, what you mean by an educated man.

Now our ancestors, whatever their other shortcomings, understood what they meant perfectly well. In their primary education and in their higher education they knew what they wanted to produce, and they suited their means to their ends. They set out with the principle that every child born into the world should be taught his duty to God and man. The majority of people had to live, as they always must, by bodily labour; therefore every boy was as early as was convenient set to labour. He was not permitted to idle about the streets or lanes. He was apprenticed to some honest industry. Either he was sent to a farm, or, if his wits were sharper, he was allotted to the village carpenter, bricklayer, tailor, shoemaker, or whatever it might be. He was instructed in some positive calling by which he could earn his bread and become a profitable member of the commonwealth. Besides this, but not, you will observe, independent of it, you had in Scotland, established by Knox, your parish schools where he was taught to read, and, if he showed special talent that way, he was made a scholar of and trained for the ministry. But neither Knox nor any one in those days thought of what we call enlarging the mind. A boy

was taught reading that he might read his Bible and learn to fear God, and be ashamed and afraid to do wrong.

An eminent American was once talking to me of the school system in the United States. The boast and glory of it, in his mind, was that every citizen born had a fair and equal start in life. Every one of them knew that he had a chance of becoming president of the republic, and was spurred to energy by the hope. Here, too, you see, is a distinct object. Young Americans are all educated alike. The aim put before them is to get on. They are like runners in a race, set to push and shoulder for the best places; never to rest contented, but to struggle forward in never-ending competition. It has answered its purpose in a new and unsettled country, where the centre of gravity has not yet determined into its place; but I cannot think that such a system as this can be permanent, or that human society, constituted on such a principle, will ultimately be found tolerable. For one thing, the prizes of life so looked at are at best but few, and the competitors many. "For myself," said the great Spinoza, "I am certain that the good of human life cannot lie in the possession of things which, for one man to possess, is for the rest to lose, but rather in things which all can possess alike, and where one man's wealth promotes his neighbour's." At any rate, it was not any such notion as this which Knox had before him when he instituted your parish schools. We had no parish schools in England for centuries after he was gone, but the object was answered by the Church catechising and the Sunday school. Our boys, like yours, were made to understand that they would have to answer for the use that they made of their lives. And, in both countries, they were put in the way of leading useful lives if they would be honest, by industrial training. The essential thing was, that every one that was willing to work should be enabled to maintain himself and his family in honour and independence.

Pass to the education of a scholar, and you find the same principle otherwise applied. There are two ways of being independent. If you require much, you must produce much. If you produce little, you must require little. Those whose studies added nothing to the material wealth of the world were taught to be content to be poor. They were a burden on others, and the burden was made as light as possible. The thirty thousand students who gathered out of Europe to Paris to listen to Abelard did not travel in carriages, and they brought no portmanteaus with them. They carried their wardrobes on their backs. They walked from Paris to Padua, from Padua to Salamanca, and they begged their way along the roads. The laws against mendicancy in all countries were suspended in favour of scholars wandering in pursuit of knowledge, and formal licences were issued to them to ask alms. At home, at his college, the scholar's fare was the hardest, his lodging was the barest. If rich in mind, he was expected to be poor in body; and so deeply was this theory grafted into English feeling that earls and dukes, when they began to frequent universities, shared the common simplicity. The furniture of a noble earl's room at an English university at present may cost, including the pictures of opera-dancers and race-horses, and such like, perhaps five hundred pounds. When the magnificent Earl of Essex was sent to Cambridge, in Elizabeth's time, his guardians provided him with a deal table covered with green baize, a truckle bed, half-a-dozen chairs, and a washhand basin. The cost of all, I think, was five pounds. You see what was meant. The scholar was held in high honour; but his contributions to the commonwealth were not appreciable in money, and were not rewarded with money. He went without what he could not produce, that he might keep his independence and his self-respect unharmed. Neither scholarship nor science starved under this treatment; more noble souls have been smothered in luxury than were ever killed by hunger. Your Knox was brought up in this way, Buchanan was brought up in this way, Luther was brought up in this way, and Tyndal, who translated the Bible, and Milton and Kepler and Spinoza, and your Robert Burns. Compare Burns, bred behind the plough, and our English Byron! This was the old education which formed the character of the English and Scotch nations. It is dying away at both extremities, as no longer suited to what is called modern civilisation. The apprenticeship as a system of instruction is gone. The discipline of poverty—not here as yet, I am happy to think, but in England—is gone also; and we have got instead what are called enlarged minds. I ask a modern march-of-intellect man what education is for; and he tells me it is to make educated men. I ask what an educated man is: he tells me it is a man whose intelligence has been cultivated, who knows something of the world he lives in—the different races of men, their languages, their histories, and the books that they have written; and again, modern science, astronomy, geology, physiology, political economy, mathematics, mechanics—everything, in fact, which an educated man ought to know.

Education, according to this, means instruction in everything which human beings have done, thought, or discovered; all history, all languages, all sciences. The demands which intelligent people imagine that they can make on the minds of students in this way are something amazing. I will give you a curious illustration of it. When the competitive examination system was first set on foot, a board of examiners met to draw up their papers of questions. The scale of requirement had first to be

settled. Among them a highly distinguished man, who was to examine in English history, announced that, for himself, he meant to set a paper for which Macaulay might possibly get full marks; and he wished the rest of the examiners to imitate him in the other subjects. I saw the paper which he set. I could myself have answered two questions out of a dozen. And it was gravely expected that ordinary young men of twenty-one, who were to be examined also in Greek and Latin, in moral philosophy, in ancient history, in mathematics, and in two modern languages, were to show a proficiency in each and all of these subjects, which a man of mature age and extraordinary talents, like Macaulay, who had devoted his whole time to that special study, had attained only in one of them. Under this system teaching becomes cramming; an enormous accumulation of propositions of all sorts and kinds is thrust down the students' throats, to be poured out again, I might say vomited out, into examiners' laps; and this when it is notorious that the sole condition of making progress in any branch of art or knowledge is to leave on one side everything irrelevant to it, and to throw your undivided energy on the special thing you have in hand. Our old universities are struggling against these absurdities. Yet, when we look at the work which they on their side are doing, it is scarcely more satisfactory. A young man going to Oxford learns the same things which were taught there two centuries ago; but, unlike the old scholars, he learns no lessons of poverty along with it. In his three years' course he will have tasted luxuries unknown to him at home, and contracted habits of self-indulgence which make subsequent hardships unbearable: while his antiquated knowledge, such as it is, has fallen out of the market; there is no demand for him; he is not sustained by the respect of the world, which finds him ignorant of everything in which it is interested. He is called educated; yet, if circumstances throw him on his own resources he cannot earn a sixpence for himself. An Oxford education fits a man extremely well for the trade of gentleman. I do not know for what other trade it does fit him as at present constituted. More than one man who has taken high honours there, who has learnt faithfully all that the university undertakes to teach him, has been seen in these late years breaking stones upon a road in Australia. That was all which he was found to be fit for when brought in contact with the primary realities of things.

It has become necessary to alter all this; but how and in what direction? If I go into modern model schools, I find first of all the three R's, about which we are all agreed; I find next the old Latin and Greek, which the schools must keep to while the universities confine their honours to these; and then, by way of keeping up with the times, "abridgments," "text-books," "elements," or whatever they are called, of a mixed multitude of matters, history, natural history, physiology, chronology, geology, political economy, and I know not what besides; general knowledge which, in my experience, means knowledge of nothing: stuff arranged admirably for one purpose, and one purpose only—to make a show in examinations. To cram a lad's mind with infinite names of things which he never handled, places he never saw or will see, statements of facts which he cannot possibly understand, and must remain merely words to him—this, in my opinion, is like loading his stomach with marbles. It is wonderful what a quantity of things of this kind a quick boy will commit to memory, how smartly he will answer questions, how he will show off in school inspections, and delight the heart of his master. But what has been gained for the boy himself, let him carry this kind of thing as far as he will, if, when he leaves school, he has to make his own living? Lord Brougham once said he hoped a time would come when every man in England would read Bacon. William Cobbett, that you may have heard of, said he would be contented if a time came when every man in England would eat bacon. People talk about enlarging the mind. Some years ago I attended a lecture on education in the Free Trade Hall at Manchester. Seven or eight thousand people were present, and among the speakers was one of the most popular orators of the day. He talked in the usual way of the neglect of past generations, the benighted peasant, in whose besotted brain even thought was extinct, and whose sole spiritual instruction was the dull and dubious parson's sermon. Then came the contrasted picture: the broad river of modern discovery flowing through town and hamlet, science shining as an intellectual sun, and knowledge and justice, as her handmaids, redressing the wrongs and healing the miseries of mankind. Then, wrapt with inspired frenzy the musical voice, thrilling with transcendent emotion—"I seem," the orator said—"I seem to hear again the echo of that voice which rolled over the primeval chaos, saying, 'Let there be light.'" As you may see a breeze of wind pass over standing corn, and every stalk bends, and a long wave sweeps across the field, so all that listening multitude swayed and wavered under the words. Yet, in plain prose, what did this gentleman definitely mean? First and foremost, a man has to earn his living, and all the 'ologies will not of themselves enable him to earn it Light! yes, we want light, but it must be light which will help us to work and find food and clothes and lodging for ourselves. A modern school will undoubtedly sharpen the wits of a clever boy. He will go out into the world with the knowledge that there are a great many good things in it which it will be highly plea-

sant to get hold of; able as yet to do no one thing for which anybody will pay him, yet bent on pushing himself forward into the pleasant places somehow. Some intelligent people think that this is a promising state of mind, that an ardent desire to better our position is the most powerful incentive that we can feel to energy and industry. A great political economist has defended the existence of a luxuriously-living idle class as supplying a motive for exertion to those who are less highly favoured. They are like Olympian gods, condescending to show themselves in their empyrean, and saying to their worshippers, "Make money, money enough, and you and your descendants shall become as we are, and shoot grouse and drink champagne all the days of your lives." No doubt this would be a highly influential incitement to activity of a sort; only it must be remembered that there are many sorts of activity, and short smooth cuts to wealth as well as long hilly roads. In civilised and artificial communities there are many ways, where fools have money and rogues want it, of effecting a change of possession. The process is at once an intellectual pleasure, extremely rapid, and every way more agreeable than dull mechanical labour. I doubt very much indeed whether the honesty of the country has been improved by the substitution so generally of mental education for industrial; and the three R's, if no industrial training has gone along with them, are apt, as Miss Nightingale observes, to produce a fourth R of rascaldom.

But it is only fair, if I quarrel alike with those who go forward and those who stand still, to offer an opinion of my own. If I call other people's systems absurd, in justice I must give them a system of my own to retort upon. Well, then, to recur once more to my question. Before we begin to build, let us have a plan of the house that we would construct. Before we begin to train a boy's mind, I will try to explain what I, for my part, would desire to see done with it. I will take the lowest scale first. I accept without qualification the first principle of our forefathers, that every boy born into the world should be put in the way of maintaining himself in honest independence. No education which does not make this its first aim is worth anything at all. There are but three ways of living, as some one has said—by working, by begging, or by stealing. Those who do not work, disguise it in whatever pretty language we please, are doing one of the other two. A poor man's child is brought here with no will of his own. We have no right to condemn him to be a mendicant or a rogue; he may fairly demand, therefore, to be put in the way of earning his bread by labour. The practical necessities must take precedence of the intellectual. A tree must be rooted in the soil before it can bear flowers and fruit. A man must learn to stand upright upon his own feet, to respect himself, to be independent of charity or accident. It is on this basis only that any superstructure of intellectual cultivation worth having can possibly be built. The old apprenticeship, therefore, was, in my opinion, an excellent system, as the world used to be. The Ten Commandments and a handicraft made a good and wholesome equipment to commence life with. Times are changed. The apprentice plan broke down; partly because it was abused for purposes of tyranny; partly because employers did not care to be burdened with boys whose labour was unprofitable; partly because it opened no road for exceptionally clever lads to rise into higher positions; they were started in a groove from which they could never afterwards escape. Yet the original necessities remain unchanged. The Ten Commandments are as obligatory as ever; and practical ability, the being able to do something and not merely to answer questions, must still be the backbone of the education of every boy who has to earn his bread by manual labour. Add knowledge afterwards as much as you will, but let it be knowledge which will lead to the doing better each particular work which a boy is practising; every fraction of it will thus be useful to him; and if he has it in him to rise, there is no fear but he will find opportunity. The poet Coleridge once said that every man might have two versions of his Bible; one the book that he read, the other the trade that he pursued, where he would find perpetual illustrations of every Bible truth in the thoughts which his occupation might open to him. I would say, less fancifully, that every honest occupation to which a man sets his hand would raise him into a philosopher if he mastered all the knowledge that belonged to his craft. Every occupation, even the meanest—I don't say the scavenger's or the chimney-sweep's—but every productive occupation which adds anything to the capital of mankind, if followed assiduously with a desire to understand everything connected with it, is an ascending stair whose summit is nowhere, and from the successive steps of which the horizon of knowledge perpetually enlarges. Take the lowest and most unskilled labour of all, that of the peasant in the field. The peasant's business is to make the earth grow food; the elementary rules of his art are the simplest, and the rude practice of it the easiest; yet between the worst agriculture and the best lies agricultural chemistry, the application of machinery, the laws of the economy of force, and the most curious problems of physiology. Each step of knowledge gained in these things can be immediately applied and realised. Each point of the science which the labourer masters will make him not only a wiser man but a better workman; and will either lift him, if he is ambitious, to a higher position, or make him more intelligent and more valuable if he remains where he is.

SRI PRATAP COLLEGE LIBRARY
SRINAGAR

If he be one of Lord Brougham's geniuses, he need not go to the "Novum Organum;" there is no direction in which his own subject will not lead him, if he cares to follow it, to the furthest boundary of thought. Only I insist on this, that information shall go along with practice, and the man's work become more profitable while he himself becomes wiser. He may then go far, or he may stop short; but whichever he do, what he has gained will be real gain, and become part and parcel of himself. It sounds like mockery to talk thus of the possible prospects of the toil-worn drudge who drags his limbs at the day's end to his straw pallet, sleeps heavily, and wakes only to renew the weary round. I am but comparing two systems of education, from each of which the expected results may be equally extravagant. I mean only that if there is to be this voice rolling over chaos again, ushering in a millennium, the way of it lies through industrial teaching, where the practical underlies the intellectual. The millions must ever be condemned to toil with their hands, or the race will cease to exist. The beneficent light, when it comes, will be a light which will make labour more productive by being more scientific; which will make the humblest drudgery not unworthy of a human being, by making it at the same time an exercise to his mind. I spoke of the field labourer. I might have gone through the catalogue of manual craftsmen, blacksmiths, carpenters, bricklayers, tailors, cobblers, fishermen, what you will. The same rule applies to them all. Detached facts on miscellaneous subjects, as they are taught at a modern school, are like separate letters of endless alphabets. You may load the mechanical memory with them till it becomes a marvel of retentiveness. Your young prodigy may amaze examiners, and delight inspectors. His achievements may be emblazoned in blue-books, and furnish matter for flattering reports on the excellence of our educational system; and all this while you have been feeding him with chips of granite. But arrange your letters into words, and each becomes a thought, a symbol waking in the mind an image of a real thing. Group your words into sentences, and thought is married to thought and produces other thoughts, and the chips of granite become soft bread, wholesome, nutritious, and invigorating. Teach your boys subjects which they can only remember mechanically, and you teach them nothing which it is worth their while to know. Teach them facts and principles which they can apply and use in the work of their lives; and if the object be to give your clever working lads a chance of rising to become presidents of the United States, or millionaires with palaces and powdered footmen, the ascent into those blessed conditions will be easier and healthier, along the track of an instructed industry, than by the paths which the most keenly sharpened wits would be apt to choose for themselves. To pass to the next scale, which more properly concerns us here. As the world requires handicrafts, so it requires those whose work is with the brain, or with brain and hand combined—doctors, lawyers, engineers, ministers of religion. Bodies become deranged, affairs become deranged, sick souls require their sores to be attended to; and so arise the learned professions, to one or other of which I presume that most of you whom I am addressing intend to belong. Well, to the education for the professions I would apply the same principle. The student should learn at the university what will enable him to earn his living as soon after he leaves it as possible. I am well aware that a professional education cannot be completed at a university; but it is true also that with every profession there is a theoretic or scientific groundwork which can be learnt nowhere so well, and, if those precious years are wasted on what is useless, will never be learnt properly at all. You are going to be a lawyer: you must learn Latin, for you cannot understand the laws of Scotland without it; but if you must learn another language, Norman French will be more useful to you than Greek, and the Acts of Parliament of Scotland more important reading than Livy or Thucydides. Are you to be a doctor?—you must learn Latin too; but neither Thucydides nor the Acts of Parliament will be of use to you—you must learn chemistry; and if you intend hereafter to keep on a level with your science, you must learn modern French and German, and learn them thoroughly well, for mistakes in your work are dangerous.

Are you to be an engineer? You must work now, when you have time, at mathematics. You will make no progress without it. You must work at chemistry; it is the grammar of all physical sciences, and there is hardly one of the physical sciences with which you may not require to be acquainted. The world is wide, and Great Britain is a small crowded island. You may wait long for employment here. Your skill will be welcomed abroad; therefore, now also, while you have time, learn French, or German, or Russian, or Chinese, or Turkish. The command of any one of these languages will secure to an English or Scotch engineer instant and unbounded occupation.

The principle that I advocate is of earth, earthy. I am quite aware of it. We are ourselves made of earth; our work is on the earth; and most of us are commonplace people, who are obliged to make the most of our time. History, poetry, logic, moral philosophy, classical literature, are excellent as ornament. If you care for such things, they may be the amusement of your leisure hereafter; but they will not help you to stand on your feet and walk alone; and no one is properly a man till he can do that. You cannot learn everything; the objects of

knowledge have multiplied beyond the powers of the strongest mind to keep pace with them all. You must choose among them, and the only reasonable guide to choice in such matters is utility. The old saying, *Non multa sed multum*, becomes every day more pressingly true. If we mean to thrive, we must take one line, and rigidly and sternly confine our energies to it. Am I told that it will make men into machines? I answer that no men are machines who are doing good work conscientiously and honestly, with the fear of their Maker before them. And if a doctor or a lawyer has it in him to become a great man, he can ascend through his profession to any height to which his talents are equal. All that is open to the handicraftsman is open to him, only that he starts a great many rounds higher up the ladder.

What I deplore in our present higher education is the devotion of so much effort and so many precious years to subjects which have no practical bearing upon life. We had a theory at Oxford that our system, however defective in many ways, yet developed in us some especially precious qualities. Classics and philosophy are called there *literæ humaniores.* They are supposed to have an effect on character, and to be specially adapted for creating ministers of religion. The training of clergymen is, if anything, the special object of Oxford teaching. All arrangements are made with a view to it. The heads of colleges, the resident fellows, tutors, professors are, with rare exceptions, ecclesiastics themselves. Well, then, if they have hold of the right idea, the effect ought to have been considerable. We have had thirty years of unexampled clerical activity among us; churches have been doubled; theological books, magazines, reviews, newspapers have been poured out by the hundreds of thousands; while by the side of it there has sprung up an equally astonishing development of moral dishonesty. From the great houses in the city of London to the village grocer the commercial life of England has been saturated with fraud. So deep it has gone that a strictly honest tradesman can hardly hold his ground against competition. You can no longer trust that any article that you buy is the thing which it pretends to be. We have false weights, false measures, cheating and shoddy elsewhere. Yet the clergy have seen all this grow up in absolute indifference; and the great question which at this moment is agitating the Church of England is the colour of the ecclesiastical petticoats. Many a hundred sermons have I heard in England, many a dissertation on the mysteries of the faith, on the divine mission of the clergy, on apostolical succession, on bishops, and justification, and the theory of good works, and verbal inspiration, and the efficacy of the sacraments; but never, during these thirty wonderful years, never one that I can recollect on common honesty, or those primitive commandments, Thou shalt not lie, and Thou shalt not steal.

The late Bishop Bloomfield used to tell a story of his having been once late in life at the University Church at Cambridge, and of having seen a verger there whom he remembered when he was himself an undergraduate. The bishop said he was glad to see him looking so well at such a great age. "Oh yes, my lord," the fellow said, "I have much to be grateful for. I have heard every sermon which has been preached in this church for fifty years, and, thank God, I am a Christian still."

Classical philosophy, classical history and literature, taking, as they do, no hold upon the living hearts and imagination of men in this modern age, leave their working intelligence a prey to wild imaginations, and make them incapable of really understanding the world in which they live. If the clergy knew as much of the history of England and Scotland as they know about Greece and Rome—if they had been ever taught to open their eyes and see what is actually round them, instead of groping among books to find what men did or thought at Alexandria or Constantinople fifteen hundred years ago, they would grapple more effectively with the moral pestilence which is poisoning all the air. What I insist upon is, generally, that in a country like ours, where each child that is born among us finds every acre of land appropriated, a universal "Not yours" set upon the rich things with which he is surrounded, and a Government which, unlike those of old Greece or modern China, does not permit superfluous babies to be strangled—such a child, I say, since he is required to live, has a right to demand such teaching as shall enable him to live with honesty, and take such a place in society as belongs to the faculties which he has brought with him. It is a right which was recognised in one shape or another by our ancestors, must be recognised now and always, if we are not to become a mutinous rabble. And it ought to be the guiding principle of all education, high and low. We have not to look any longer to this island only. There is an abiding place now for Englishmen and Scots wherever our flag is flying. This narrow Britain, once our only home, has become the breeding-place and nursery of a race which is spreading over the world. Year after year we are swarming as the bees swarm; and year after year, and I hope more and more, high-minded young men of all ranks will prefer free air and free elbow-room for mind and body to the stool and desk of the dingy office, the ill-paid drudgery of the crowded ranks of the professions, or the hopeless labour of our home farmsteads and workshops.

Education always should contemplate this larger sphere, and cultivate the capacities which will command success there. Britain may have yet a future before it grander than its past; in-

stead of a country standing alone, complete in itself, it may become the metropolis of an enormous and coherent empire; but on this condition only, that her children, when they leave her shores, shall look back upon her, not—like the poor Irish when they fly to America—as a stepmother who gave them stones for bread, but as a mother to whose care and nurture they shall owe their after-prosperity. Whether this shall be so, whether England has reached its highest point of greatness, and will now descend to a second place among the nations, or whether it has yet before it another era of brighter glory, depends on ourselves, and depends more than anything on the breeding which we give to our children. The boy that is kindly nurtured, and wisely taught and assisted to make his way in life, does not forget his father and his mother. He is proud of his family, and jealous for the honour of the name that he bears. If the million lads that swarm in our towns and villages are so trained that at home or in the colonies they can provide for themselves, without passing first through a painful interval of suffering, they will be loyal wherever they may be; good citizens at home, and still Englishmen and Scots on the Canadian lakes or in New Zealand. Our island shores will be stretched till they cover half the globe. It was not so that we colonised America, and we are reaping now the reward of our carelessness. We sent America our convicts. We sent America our Pilgrim Fathers, flinging them out as worse than felons. We said to the Irish cottar—You are a burden upon the rates; go find a home elsewhere. Had we offered him a home in the enormous territories that belong to us, we might have sent him to places where he would have been no burden but a blessing. But we bade him carelessly go where he would, and shift as he could for himself; he went with a sense of burning wrong, and he left a festering sore behind him. Injustice and heedlessness have borne their proper fruits. We have raised up against us a mighty empire to be the rival, it may be the successful rival, of our power. Loyalty, love of kindred, love of country, we know not what we are doing when we trifle with feelings the most precious and beautiful that belong to us—most beautiful, most enduring, most hard to be obliterated—yet feelings which, when they are obliterated, cannot change to neutrality and cold friendship. Americans still, in spite of themselves, speak of England as home. They tell us they must be our brothers or our enemies, and which of the two they will ultimately be is still uncertain.

I beg your pardon for this digression, but there are subjects upon which we feel sometimes compelled to speak in season and out of it. To go back, I shall be asked whether, after all, this earning our living, this getting on in the world, are not low objects for human beings to set before themselves. Is not spirit more than matter? Is there no such thing as pure intellectual culture? "Philosophy," says Novalis, "will bake no bread, but it gives us our souls; it gives us heaven; it gives us knowledge of those grand truths which concern us as immortal beings." Was it not said, "Take no thought what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, or wherewithal ye shall be clothed? Your Heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. Behold the lilies of the field, they toil not, neither do they spin. Yet Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these." This is not entirely a dream. But such high counsels as these are addressed only to few; and perhaps fewer still have heart to follow them. If you choose the counsels of perfection, count the cost, and understand what they mean. I knew a student once from whose tongue dropped the sublimest of sentiments; who was never weary of discoursing on beauty and truth and lofty motives; who seemed to be longing for some gulf to jump into, like the Roman Curtius—some "fine opening for a young man" into which to plunge and devote himself for the benefit of mankind. Yet he was running all the while into debt, squandering the money on idle luxuries which his father was sparing out of a narrow income to give him a college education; dreaming of martyrdom, and unable to sacrifice a single pleasure! The words which I quoted were not spoken to all the disciples, but to the apostles who were about to wander over the world as barefoot missionaries. High above all occupations which have their beginning and end in the seventy years of mortal life stand undoubtedly the unproductive callings which belong to spiritual culture. Only let not those who say we will devote ourselves to truth, to wisdom, to science, to art, expect to be rewarded with the wages of the other professions. University education in England was devoted to spiritual culture, and assumed its present character in consequence; but, as I told you before, it taught originally the accompanying necessary lesson of poverty. The ancient scholar lived, during his course, upon alms—alms either from living patrons, or founders and benefactors. But the scale of his allowance provided for no indulgences; either he learned something besides his Latin, or he learned to endure hardship. And if a university persists in teaching nothing but what it calls the humanities, it is bound to insist also on rough clothing, hard beds, and common food. For myself, I admire that ancient rule of the Jews that every man, no matter of what grade or calling, shall learn some handicraft; that the man of intellect, while, like St Paul, he is teaching the world, yet, like St Paul, may be burdensome to no one. A man was not considered entitled to live if he could not keep himself from starving. Surely those university men who had taken honours, breaking stones on an Australian road, were sorry spectacles; and

still more sorry and disgraceful is the outcry coming by every mail from our colonies: "Send us no more of what you call educated men; send us smiths, masons, carpenters, day labourers; all of those will thrive, will earn their eight, ten, or twelve shillings a day; but your educated man is a log on our hands; he loafs in uselessness till his means are spent, he then turns billiard-marker, enlists as a soldier, or starves." It hurts no intellect to be able to make a boat, or a house, or a pair of shoes, or a suit of clothes, or hammer a horse-shoe; and if you can do either of these, you have nothing to fear from fortune. "I will work with my hands, and keep my brain for myself," said some one proudly, when it was proposed to him that he should make a profession of literature. Spinoza, the most powerful intellectual worker that Europe has produced during the last two centuries, waiving aside the pensions and legacies that were thrust upon him, chose to maintain himself by grinding object-glasses for microscopes and telescopes. If a son of mine told me that he wished to devote himself to intellectual pursuits, I would act as I should act if he wished to make an imprudent marriage. I would absolutely prohibit him for a time, till the firmness of his purpose had been tried. If he stood the test, and showed real talent, I would insist that he should in some way make himself independent of the profits of intellectual work for subsistence. Scholars and philosophers were originally clergymen. Nowadays a great many people whose tendencies lie in the clerical direction yet for various reasons shrink from the obligations which the office imposes. They take, therefore, to literature, and attempt and expect to make a profession of it.

Without taking a transcendental view of the matter, literature happens to be the only occupation in which the wages are not in proportion to the goodness of the work done. It is not that they are generally small, but the adjustment of them is awry. It is true that in all callings nothing great will be produced if the first object be what you can make by them. To do what you do well should be the first thing, the wages the second; but except in the instances of which I am speaking, the rewards of a man are in proportion to his skill and industry. The best carpenter receives the highest pay. The better he works the better for his prospects. The best lawyer, the best doctor commands most practice and makes the largest fortune. But with literature, a different element is introduced into the problem. The present rule on which authors are paid is by the page and the sheet; the more words the more pay. It ought to be exactly the reverse. Great poetry, great philosophy, great scientific discovery, every intellectual production which has genius, worth, and permanence in it, is the fruit of long thought and patient and painful elaboration. Work of this kind, done hastily, is better not done at all. When completed it will be small in bulk; it will address itself for a long time to the few and not to the many. The reward for it will not be measurable, and not obtainable in money except after many generations, when the brain out of which it was spun has long returned to its dust. Only by accident is a work of genius immediately popular, in the sense of being widely bought. No collected edition of Shakespeare's plays was demanded in Shakespeare's life. Milton received five pounds for "Paradise Lost." The distilled essence of the thought of Bishop Butler, the greatest prelate that the English Church ever produced, fills a moderate-sized octavo volume; Spinoza's works, including his surviving letters, fill but three; and though they have revolutionised the philosophy of Europe, have no attractions for the multitude. A really great man has to create the taste with which he is to be enjoyed. There are splendid exceptions of merit eagerly recognised and early rewarded—our honoured English laureate, for instance, Alfred Tennyson, or your own countryman, Thomas Carlyle. Yet even Tennyson waited through ten years of depreciation before poems which are now on every one's lips passed into a second edition. Carlyle, whose transcendent powers were welcomed in their infancy by Goethe, who long years ago was recognised by statesmen and thinkers in both hemispheres as the most remarkable of living men; yet, if success be measured by what has been paid him for his services, stands far below your Belgravian novelist. A hundred years hence, perhaps, people at large will begin to understand how vast a man has been among them.

If you make literature a trade to live by, you will be tempted always to take your talents to the most profitable market; and the most profitable market will be no assurance to you that you are making a noble or even a worthy use of them. Better a thousand times, if your object is to advance your position in life, that you should choose some other calling, of which making money is a legitimate aim, and where your success will vary as the goodness of your work; better for yourselves, for your consciences, for your own souls, as we used to say, and for the world you live in. Therefore, I say, if any of you choose this mode of spending your existence, choose it deliberately, with a full knowledge of what you are doing. Reconcile yourselves to the condition of the old scholars. Make up your minds to be poor—care only for what is true and right and good. On those conditions you may add something real to the intellectual stock of mankind, and mankind in return may perhaps give you bread enough to live upon, though bread extremely thinly spread with butter.

We live in times of change—political change,

intellectual change, change of all kinds. You whose minds are active, especially such of you as give yourselves much to speculation, will be drawn inevitably into profoundly interesting yet perplexing questions, of which our fathers and grandfathers knew nothing. Practical men engaged in business take formulas for granted. They cannot be for ever running to first principles. They hate to see established opinions disturbed. Opinions, however, will and must be disturbed from time to time. There is no help for it. The minds of ardent and clever students are particularly apt to move fast in these directions; and thus, when they go out into the world, they find themselves exposed to one of two temptations, according to their temperament; either to lend themselves to what is popular and plausible, to conceal their real convictions, to take up with what we call in England humbug, to humbug others, or perhaps, to keep matters still smoother, to humbug themselves; or else to quarrel violently with things which they imagine to be passing away, and which they consider should be quick in doing it, as having no basis in truth. A young man of ability nowadays is extremely likely to be tempted into one or other of these lines. The first is the more common on my side of the Tweed; the harsher and more thoroughgoing, perhaps, on yours. Things are changing, and have to change; but they change very slowly. The established authorities are in possession of the field, and are naturally desirous to keep it. And there is no kind of service which they more eagerly reward than the support of clever fellows who have dipped over the edge of latitudinarianism, who profess to have sounded the disturbing currents of the intellectual seas, and discovered that they are accidental or unimportant. On the other hand, men who cannot away with this kind of thing are likely to be exasperated into unwise demonstrativeness, to become Radicals in politics and Radicals in thought. Their private disapprobation bursts into open enmity; and this road, too, if they continue long upon it, leads to no healthy conclusions. No one can thrive upon denials: positive truth of some kind is essential as food both for mind and character. Depend upon it, that in all long-established practices or spiritual formulas there has been some living truth; and if you have not discovered and learned to respect it, you do not yet understand the questions which you are in a hurry to solve. And again, intellectually impatient people should remember the rules of social courtesy, which forbid us in private to say things, however true, which can give pain to others. These rules forbid us equally in public to obtrude opinions which offend those who do not share them, yet require us to pause and consider. Our thoughts and our conduct are our own. We may say justly to any one, You shall not make me profess to think true what I believe to be false—you shall not make me do what I do not think just; but there our natural liberty ends. Others have as good a right to their opinion as we have to ours. To any one who holds what are called advanced views on serious subjects, I recommend a long-suffering reticence and the reflection that, after all, he may possibly be wrong. Whether we are Radicals or Conservatives, we require to be often reminded that truth or falsehood, justice and injustice, are no creatures of our own belief. We cannot make true things false, or false things true, by choosing to think them so. We cannot vote right into wrong, or wrong into right. The eternal truths and rights of things exist, fortunately, independent of our thoughts or wishes, fixed as mathematics, inherent in the nature of man and the world. They are no more to be trifled with than gravitation. If we discover and obey them, it is well with us; but that is all we can do. You can no more make a social regulation work well which is not just than you can make water run uphill. I tell you, therefore, who take up with plausibilities, not to trust your weight too far upon them, and not to condemn others for having misgivings which at the bottom of your own minds, if you look so deep, you will find that you share yourselves with them. You, who believe that you have hold of newer and wider truths, show it, as you may and must show it, unless you are misled by your own dreams, in leading wider, simpler, and nobler lives. Assert your own freedom if you will, but assert it modestly and quietly; respecting others as you wish to be respected yourselves. Only and especially I would say this: be honest with yourselves, whatever the temptation; say nothing to others that you do not think, and play no tricks with your own minds. Of all the evil spirits abroad at this hour in the world, insincerity is the most dangerous.

> "This above all. To your own selves be true,
> And it will soon follow, as the night the day,
> You cannot then be false to any man."

CHARLES KINGSLEY.

1819-1875.

HEAVEN ON EARTH.

MEN eat, and drink, and do all manner of things, with all their might and main; but how many of them do they do to the glory of God? No; this is the fault—the especial curse of our day, that religion does not mean any longer, as it used, the service of God—the being like God, and showing forth God's glory. No; religion means, nowadays, the art of getting to heaven when we die, and saving our own miserable souls from hell, and getting God's wages without doing God's work—as if that was godliness—as if that was anything but selfishness; as if selfishness was any the better for being everlasting selfishness! If selfishness is evil, my friends, the sooner we get rid of it the better, instead of mixing it up as we do with all our thoughts of heaven, and making our own enjoyment and our own safety the vile root of our hopes for all eternity. And therefore it is that people have forgotten what God's glory is. They seem to think that God's highest glory is saving them from hell-fire. . . .

For what is doing everything to the glory of God? It is this: we have seen what God's glory is: He is His own glory. As you say of any very excellent man, you have but to know him to honour him; or of any very beautiful woman, you have but to see her to love her; so I say of God, men have but to see and know Him to love and honour Him.

Well, then, my friends, if we call ourselves Christian men, if we believe that God is our Father, and delight, as on the grounds of common feeling we ought, to honour our Father, we should try to make every one honour Him. In short, whatever we do we should make it tend to His glory—make it a lesson to our neighbours, our friends, and our families. We should preach God's glory day by day, not by *words* only, often not by words at all, but by our conduct. Ay, there is the secret. If you wish other men to believe a thing, just behave as if you believed it yourself. Nothing is so infectious as example. If you wish your neighbours to see what Jesus Christ is like, let them see what He can make *you* like. If you wish them to know how God's love is ready to save them from their sins, let them see His love save *you* from *your* sins. If you wish them to see God's tender care in every blessing and every sorrow they have, why, let them see you thanking God for every sorrow and every blessing you have. I tell you, friends, example is everything. One good man—one man who does not put his religion on once a week with his Sunday coat, but wears it for his working dress, and lets the thought of God grow into him, and through and through him, till everything he says and does becomes religious, that man is worth a thousand sermons—he is a living Gospel—he comes in the spirit and power of Elias—he is the image of God. And men see his good works, and admire them in spite of themselves, and see that they are Godlike, and that God's grace is no dream, but that the Holy Spirit is still among men, and that all nobleness and manliness is His gift, His stamp, His picture, and so they get a glimpse of God again in His saints and heroes, and glorify their Father who is in heaven.

Would not such a life be a heavenly life? Ay, it would be more, it would be heaven—heaven on earth: not in mere fine words, but really. We should then be sitting, as St Paul tells us, in heavenly places with Jesus Christ, and having our conversation in heaven. All the while we were doing our daily work, following our business, or serving our country, or sitting at our own firesides with wife and child, we should be all that time in heaven. Why not? we are in heaven now—if we had but faith to see it. Oh, get rid of those carnal, heathen notions about heaven, which tempt men to fancy that, after having misused this place—God's earth—for a whole life, they are to fly away when they die, like swallows in autumn, to another place—they know not where—where they are to be very happy—they know not why or how, nor do I know either. Heaven is not a mere *place*, my friends. All places are heaven if you will be heavenly in them. Heaven is where God is and Christ is; and hell is where God is not and Christ is not. The Bible says, no doubt, there is a place now—somewhere beyond the skies—where Christ especially shows forth His glory—a heaven of heavens: and for reasons which I cannot explain, there must be such a place. But, at all events, here is heaven; for Christ is here and God is here, if we will open our eyes and see them. And how?—How? Did not Christ himself say, "If a man will love me, my Father will love him; and we, my Father and I, will come to him, and make our abode with him, and we will show ourselves to him?" Do those words mean nothing or something? If they have any meaning, do they not mean this, that in this life we can see God—in this life we can have God and Christ abiding with us? And is not that heaven? Yes, heaven is where God is. You are in heaven if God is

with you, you are in hell if God is not with you; for where God is not, darkness and a devil are sure to be.

There was a great poet once—Dante by name—who described most truly and wonderfully, in his own way, heaven and hell, for indeed he had been in both. He had known sin and shame, and doubt and darkness and despair, which is hell. And after long years of misery, he had got to know love and hope, and holiness and nobleness, and the love of Christ and the peace of God, which is heaven. And so well did he speak of them that the ignorant people used to point after him with awe in the streets, and whisper, There is the man who has been in hell. Whereon some one made these lines on him:

"Thou hast seen hell and heaven? Why not? since heaven and hell
Within the struggling soul of every mortal dwell."

Think of that!—thou—and thou—and thou!—for in thee, at this moment, is either heaven or hell. And which of them? Ask thyself, ask thyself, friend. If thou art not in heaven in this life, thou wilt never be in heaven in the life to come. At death, says the wise man, each thing returns into its own element, into the ground of its life; the light into the light, and the darkness into the darkness. As the tree falls, so it lies. My friends, you who call yourselves enlightened Christian folk, do you suppose that you can lead a mean, worldly, covetous, spiteful life here, and then, the moment your soul leaves the body, that you are to be changed into the very opposite character, into angels and saints, as fairy tales tell of beasts changed into men? If a beast can be changed into a man, then death can change the sinner into a saint—but not else. If a beast would enjoy being a man, then a sinner would enjoy being in heaven—but not else. A sinful, worldly man enjoy being in heaven? Does a fish enjoy being on dry land? The sinner would long to be back in this world again. Why, what is the employment of spirits in heaven, according to the Bible (for that is the point to which I have been trying to lead you round again)? What but glorifying God? Not *trying* only to do everything to God's glory, but actually succeeding in *doing* it—basking in the sunshine of His smile, delighting to feel themselves as nothing before His glorious majesty, meditating on the beauty of His love, filling themselves with the sight of His power, searching out the treasures of His wisdom, and finding God in all and all in God—their whole eternity one act of worship, one hymn of praise. Are there not some among us who will have had but little practice at that work? Those who have done nothing for God's glory here, how do they expect to be able to do everything for God's glory hereafter? Those who will not take the trouble of merely standing up at the Psalms, like the rest of their neighbours, even if they cannot sing with their voices God's praises in this church, how will they like singing God's praises through eternity? No; be sure that the only people who will be fit for heaven, who will like heaven even, are those who have been in heaven in this life—the only people who will be able to do everything to God's glory in the new heavens and new earth, are those who have been trying honestly to do all to His glory in this heaven and this earth.

EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

The education which I set before you is not to be got by mere hearing lectures or reading books: for it is an education of your whole character; a self-education; which really means a committing of yourself to God, that He may educate you. Hearing lectures is good, for it will teach you how much there is to be known, and how little you know. Reading books is good, for it will give you habits of regular and diligent study. And therefore I urge on you strongly private study, especially in case a library should be formed here, of books on those most practical subjects of which I have been speaking. But, after all, both lectures and books are good, mainly in as far as they furnish matter for reflection; while the desire to reflect and the ability to reflect must come, as I believe, from above. The honest craving after light and power, after knowledge, wisdom, active usefulness, must come—and may it come to you—by the inspiration of the Spirit of God.

Let me ask women to educate themselves, not for their own sakes merely, but for the sake of others. For, whether they will or not, they must educate others. I do not speak merely of those who may be engaged in the work of direct teaching; that they ought to be well taught themselves, who can doubt? I speak of those—and in so doing I speak of every woman, young and old—who exercises as wife, as mother, as aunt, as sister, or as friend, an influence, indirect it may be, and unconscious, but still potent and practical, on the minds and characters of those about them, especially of men. How potent and practical that influence is, those know best who know most of the world and most of human nature. There are those who consider—and I agree with them—that the education of boys under the age of twelve years ought to be entrusted as much as possible to women. Let me ask—of what period of youth and of manhood does not the same hold true? I pity the ignorance and conceit of the man who fancies that he has nothing left to learn from cultivated women. I should have thought that the very mission of women was to be, in the highest sense, the educator of man from infancy to old age; that that was the work towards which all the God-given capacities of women pointed, for which they

were to be educated to the highest pitch. I should have thought that it was the glory of woman, that she was sent into the world to live for others, rather than for herself; and therefore I should say—Let her smallest rights be respected, her smallest wrongs redressed; but let her never be persuaded to forget that she is sent into the world to teach man—what, I believe, she has been teaching him all along, even in the savage state—namely, that there is something more necessary than the claiming of rights, and that is, the performing of duties; to teach him specially, in these so-called intellectual days, that there is something more than intellect, and that is—purity and virtue. Let her never be persuaded to forget that her calling is not the lower and more earthly one of self-assertion, but the higher and the diviner calling of self-sacrifice; and let her never desert that higher life, which lives in others and for others, like her Redeemer and her Lord.

And, if any should answer, that this doctrine would keep woman a dependant and a slave, I answer—Not so; it would keep her what she should be—the mistress of all around her, because mistress of herself. And more, I should express a fear that those who made that answer had not yet seen into the mystery of true greatness and true strength; that they did not yet understand the true magnanimity, the true royalty of that spirit, by which the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

Surely that is woman's calling—to teach man: and to teach him what? To teach him, after all, that his calling is the same as hers, if he will but see the things which belong to his peace. To temper his fiercer, coarser, more self-assertive nature, by the contact of her gentleness, purity, self-sacrifice. To make him see that not by blare of trumpets, not by noise, wrath, greed, ambition, intrigue, puffery, is good and lasting work to be done on earth: but by wise self-distrust, by silent labour, by lofty self-control, by that charity which hopeth all things, believeth all things, endureth all things; by such an example, in short, as women now in tens of thousands set to those around them; such as they will show more and more, the more their whole womanhood is educated to employ its powers without waste and without haste in harmonious unity.

CHARLES HADDON SPURGEON.

1834-——.

SERMONS—THEIR MATTER.*

We must throw all our strength of judgment, memory, imagination, and eloquence, into the delivery of the Gospel; and not give to the preaching of the cross our random thoughts while wayside topics engross our deeper meditations. Depend upon it, if we brought the intellect of a Locke or a Newton, and the eloquence of a Cicero, to bear upon the simple doctrine of "believe and live," we should find no surplus strength. Brethren, first and above all things, keep to plain evangelical doctrines; whatever else you do or do not preach, be sure incessantly to bring forth the soul-saving truth of Christ and Him crucified. I know a minister whose shoe-latchet I am unworthy to unloose, whose preaching is often little better than sacred miniature painting — I might also say holy trifling. He is great upon the ten toes of the beast, the four faces of the cherubim, the mystical meaning of badgers' skins, and the typical bearings of the staves of the ark, and the windows of Solomon's temple: but the sins of business men, the temptations of the times, and the needs of the age, he scarcely ever touches upon. Such preaching reminds me of a lion engaged in mouse-hunting, or a man-of-war cruising after a lost water-butt. Topics scarcely in importance equal to what Peter calls "old wives' fables," are made great matters of by those microscopic divines to whom the nicety of a point is more attractive than the saving of souls. You will have read in Todd's "Student's Manual" that Harcatius, King of Persia, was a notable mole-catcher; and Briantes, King of Lydia, was equally *au fait* at filing needles; but these trivialities by no means prove them to have been great kings: it is much the same in the ministry; there is such a thing as meanness of mental occupation unbecoming the rank of an ambassador of heaven.

Among a certain order of minds at this time the Athenian desire of telling or hearing some new thing appears to be predominant. They boast of new light, and claim a species of inspiration which warrants them in condemning all who are out of their brotherhood, and yet their grand revelation relates to a mere circumstantial of worship, or to an obscure interpretation of

---

* From "Lectures to My Students," by permission of Mr Spurgeon, and Messrs Passmore & Alabaster, the publishers.

prophecy; so that, at sight of their great fuss and loud cry concerning so little, we are reminded of

"Ocean into tempest tossed
To waft a feather or to drown a fly."

Worse still are those who waste time in insinuating doubts concerning the authenticity of texts, or the correctness of Biblical statements concerning natural phenomena. Painfully do I call to mind hearing one Sabbath evening a deliverance called a sermon, of which the theme was a clever inquiry as to whether an angel did actually descend, and stir the pool at Bethesda, or whether it was an intermitting spring, concerning which Jewish superstition had invented a legend. Dying men and women were assembled to hear the way of salvation, and they were put off with such vanity as this! They came for bread, and received a stone; the sheep looked up to the shepherd, and were not fed. Seldom do I hear a sermon, and when I do I am grievously unfortunate, for one of the last I was entertained with was intended to be a justification of Joshua for destroying the Canaanites, and another went to prove that it was not good for man to be alone. How many souls were converted in answer to the prayers before these sermons I have never been able to ascertain, but I shrewdly suspect that no unusual rejoicing disturbed the serenity of the golden streets.

Believing my next remark to be almost universally unneeded, I bring it forward with diffidence—do not overload a sermon with too much matter. All truth is not to be comprised in one discourse. Sermons are not to be bodies of divinity. There is such a thing as having too much to say, and saying it till hearers are sent home loathing rather than longing. An old minister walking with a young preacher, pointed to a cornfield, and observed, "Your last sermon had too much in it, and it was not clear enough, or sufficiently well-arranged; it was like that field of wheat, it contained much crude food, but none fit for use. You should make your sermons like a loaf of bread, fit for eating, and in convenient form." It is to be feared that human heads (speaking phrenologically) are not so capacious for theology as they once were, for our forefathers rejoiced in sixteen ounces of divinity, undiluted and unadorned, and could continue receiving it for three or four hours at a stretch, but our more degenerate, or perhaps more busy generation requires about an ounce of doctrine at a time, and that must be the concentrated extract or essential oil, rather than the entire substance of divinity. We must in these times say a great deal in a few words, but not too much, nor with too much amplification. One thought fixed on the mind will be better than fifty thoughts made to flit across the ear. One tenpenny nail driven home and clenched will be more useful than a score of tin-tacks loosely fixed, to be pulled out again in an hour.

Our matter should be well arranged according to the true rules of mental architecture. Not practical inferences at the basis and doctrines as the topstones; not metaphors in the foundations, and propositions at the summit; not the more important truths first and the minor teachings last, after the manner of an anti-climax; but the thought must climb and ascend; one stair of teaching leading to another; one door of reasoning conducting to another, and the whole elevating the hearer to a chamber from whose windows truth is seen gleaming in the light of God. In preaching, have a place for everything, and everything in its place. Never suffer truths to fall from you pell-mell. Do not let your thoughts rush as a mob, but make them march as a troop of soldiery. Order, which is heaven's first law, must not be neglected by heaven's ambassadors.

Your doctrinal teaching should be clear and unmistakable. To be so it must first of all be clear to yourself. Some men think in smoke and preach in a cloud. Your people do not want a luminous haze, but the solid *terra firma* of truth. Philosophical speculations put certain minds into a semi-intoxicated condition, in which they either see everything double, or see nothing at all. The head of a certain college in Oxford was years ago asked by a stranger what was the motto of the arms of that university. He told him that it was "*Dominus illuminatio mea.*" But he also candidly informed the stranger that, in his private opinion, a motto more appropriate might be, "*Aristoteles meæ tenebræ.*" Sensational writers have half crazed many honest men who have conscientiously read their lucubrations out of a notion that they ought to be abreast of the age, as if such a necessity might not also require us to attend the theatres in order to be able to judge the new plays, or frequent the turf that we might not be too bigoted in our opinions upon racing and gambling. For my part, I believe that the chief readers of heterodox books are ministers, and that if they would not notice them they would fall still-born from the press. Let a minister keep clear of mystifying himself, and then he is on the road to becoming intelligible to his people. No man can hope to be felt who cannot make himself understood. If we give our people refined truth, pure scriptural doctrine, and all so worded as to have no needless obscurity about it, we shall be true shepherds of the sheep, and the profiting of our people will soon be apparent.

Endeavour to keep the matter of your sermonising as fresh as you can. Do not rehearse five or six doctrines with unvarying monotony of repetition. Buy a theological barrel-organ, brethren, with five tunes accurately adjusted, and you will be qualified to practise as an ultra-

Calvinistic preacher at Zoar and Jireh, if you also purchase at some vinegar factory a good supply of bitter, acrid abuse of Arminians, and duty-faith men. Brains and grace are optional, but the organ and the wormwood are indispensable. It is ours to perceive and rejoice in a wider range of truth. All that these good men hold of grace and sovereignty we maintain as firmly and boldly as they; but we dare not shut our eyes to other teachings of the Word, and we feel bound to make full proof of our ministry, by declaring the whole counsel of God. With abundant themes diligently illustrated by fresh metaphors and experiences, we shall not weary, but, under God's hand, shall win our hearers' ears and hearts.

Let your teachings grow and advance; let them deepen with your experience, and rise with your soul-progress. I do not mean preach new truths; for, on the contrary, I hold that man happy who is so well taught from the first that, after fifty years of ministry, he has never had to recant a doctrine or to mourn an important omission; but I mean, let our depth and insight continually increase, and where there is spiritual advance it will be so. Timothy could not preach like Paul. Our earlier productions must be surpassed by those of our riper years; we must never make these our models; they will be best burned, or only preserved to be mourned over because of their superficial character. It were ill, indeed, if we knew no more, after being many years in Christ's school; our progress may be slow, but progress there must be, or there will be cause to suspect that the inner life is lacking or sadly unhealthy. Set it before you as most certain that you have not yet attained, and may grace be given you to press forward towards that which is yet beyond. May you all become able ministers of the New Testament, and not a whit behind the very chief of preachers, though in yourselves you will still be nothing.

The word "sermon" is said to signify a thrust, and, therefore, in sermonising it must be our aim to use the subject in hand with energy and effect, and the subject must be capable of such employment. To choose mere moral themes will be to use a wooden dagger; but the great truths of revelation are as sharp swords. Keep to doctrines which stir the conscience and the heart. Remain unwaveringly the champions of a soul-winning Gospel. God's truth is adapted to man, and God's grace adapts man to it. There is a key which, under God, can wind up the musical box of man's nature; get it, and use it daily. Hence I urge you to keep to the old-fashioned Gospel, and to that only, for assuredly it is the power of God unto salvation.

Of all I would wish to say this is the sum; my brethren, preach Christ, always and evermore. He is the whole Gospel. His person, offices, and work must be our one great, all-comprehending theme. The world needs still to be told of its Saviour, and of the way to reach Him. Justification by faith should be far more than it is the daily testimony of Protestant pulpits; and if with this master-truth there should be more generally associated the other great doctrines of grace, the better for our churches and our age. If with the zeal of Methodists we can preach the doctrine of Puritans a great future is before us. The fire of Wesley, and the fuel of Whitfield, will cause a burning which shall set the forests of error on fire, and warm the very soul of this cold earth. We are not called to proclaim philosophy and metaphysics, but the simple Gospel. Man's fall, his need of a new birth, forgiveness through an atonement, and salvation as the result of faith, these are our battle-axe and weapons of war. We have enough to do to learn and teach these great truths, and accursed be that learning which shall divert us from our mission, or that wilful ignorance which shall cripple us in its pursuit. More and more am I jealous lest any views upon prophecy, church government, politics, or even systematic theology, should withdraw one of us from glorying in the cross of Christ. Salvation is a theme for which I would fain enlist every holy tongue. I am greedy after witnesses for the glorious Gospel of the blessed God. O that Christ crucified were the universal burden of men of God. Your guess at the number of the beast, your Napoleonic speculations, your conjectures concerning a personal Antichrist—forgive me, I count them but mere bones for dogs; while men are dying, and hell is filling, it seems to me the veriest drivel to be muttering about an Armageddon at Sebastopol or Sadowa or Sedan, and peeping between the folded leaves of destiny to discover the fate of Germany. Blessed are they who read and hear the words of the prophecy of the Revelation, but the like blessing has evidently not fallen on those who pretend to expound it, for generation after generation of them have been proved to be in error by the mere lapse of time, and the present race will follow to the same inglorious sepulchre. I would sooner pluck one single brand from the burning than explain all mysteries. To win a soul from going down into the pit is a more glorious achievement than to be crowned in the arena of theological controversy as *Doctor Sufficientissimus;* to have faithfully unveiled the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ will be in the final judgment accounted worthier service than to have solved the problems of the religious Sphinx, or to have cut the Gordian knot of apocalyptic difficulty. Blessed is that ministry of which Christ is all.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICES.

ATTERBURY, FRANCIS, was born at Middleton, in Buckinghamshire, in 1662-3. He studied under Dr Busby at Westminster School, and in 1680 was elected a student of Christ Church, Oxford, under Dr Fell. He was a hard student, and excelled in literature and mathematics. In 1691 he left the university, was ordained, and became a popular preacher. He was appointed Dean of Christ Church in 1711, and Bishop of Rochester, with the deanery of Westminster *in commendam*, in 1713. On his refusal to sign the Declaration against Rebellion he was committed to the Tower on a charge of high treason in 1722. He defended himself eloquently, but unsuccessfully, in a speech before the House of Lords, May 11, 1723; but he was exiled to France. He died at Paris, in his seventieth year, in 1732.

BARROW, ISAAC, was born in London in 1630. He attended the Charterhouse School—a school at Felstead—and entered Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1645. He was elected fellow of the college in 1649. He studied medicine, but came back to divinity, mathematics, and astronomy. He travelled in France, Italy, and Turkey for some years, and on his return to England in 1659 he took orders. He was appointed Professor of Greek at Cambridge in 1660, and in 1662 Gresham Professor of Geometry, which latter office he resigned in 1669, in order to devote himself to the study of divinity. Sir Isaac Newton was his successor, and he had the honour of first recognising his talents, when an undergraduate. In 1672 he was elected Master of Trinity, and died in 1677, in the forty-seventh year of his age. His sermons are remarkable for the freedom with which he handles moral and doctrinal subjects, and also matters of every-day practical life.

BAXTER, RICHARD, the great nonconformist preacher, was born in Shropshire in 1615. Being ordained in 1638, he preached for some time at Dudley and Bridgenorth, and in 1640 became parish minister of Kidderminster. He was for some time chaplain to a regiment in the Parliamentary army. He returned to Kidderminster, but was obliged to quit his living on the passing of the Act of Uniformity. He was about ten years employed in writing, until in 1672 he went to London, and again engaged in occasional preaching. Baxter died in 1691. His best known works are the "Saints' Everlasting Rest," "Dying Thoughts," and "Call to the Unconverted." The principal passages in his life are recorded in his "Reliquiæ Baxterianæ."

BLAIR, DR HUGH, was a native of Edinburgh, and born in 1718. He filled a country charge in Fifeshire for a short time, but was afterwards successively promoted to Canongate, Lady Yester's, and the High Church in Edinburgh. He became celebrated for a particular style of pulpit eloquence. The first volume of his sermons appeared in 1777, the sale of which was both rapid and extensive. This was followed by three other volumes, and by a fifth after his death. His "Rhetorical Lectures" were also well received. A pension of £200 per annum was conferred upon him, July 25, 1780. He died on 27th December 1800.

BRIGHT, THE RIGHT HON. JOHN, was born at Greenbank, near Rochdale in 1811, and was a partner in the firm of John Bright & Brothers, manufacturers there. During the discussion of the Reform Bill of 1831-32 he distinguished himself, and also became one of the earliest members, and was a powerful orator and advocate, along with Richard Cobden, in favour of the Anti-Corn Law League. After the triumph of this league by the legislature decreeing free trade, this body was dissolved at Manchester in 1846. He represented Durham in Parliament from 1843 to 1847, when in the latter year he was returned for Manchester. He represented Manchester in the House of Commons from 1847 to 1857, when in the latter year he was returned for Birmingham. In June 1883, his 25 years of service to Birmingham was recognised by a series of popular demonstrations. Mr. Bright's name stands identified with many popular measures; chief amongst them are his labours on behalf of free trade, and a scheme for the reform of the electoral representation. During the discussion of the Eastern Question, under Lord Aberdeen's ministry, he denounced the Russian war. He advocated the policy of

the North during the American civil war. On November 3, 1868, he was presented with the freedom of the city of Edinburgh, and in 1869 he accepted office as President of the Board of Trade. In 1873 he took office as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, and again in 1881. He retired from the Gladstone ministry in 1882. He died March 27, 1889.

BROUGHAM, HENRY, LORD, son of Henry Brougham, younger of Brougham Hall, Westmoreland, was born in Edinburgh in 1778 or 1779. He was sent to the High School, and early showed signs of great mental precocity. He went to the university, and in 1796 contributed a paper to the *Philosophical Transactions* on "Experiments and Observations on the Inflection, Reflection, and Colours of Light." After the publication of the third number of the *Edinburgh Review* he was invited to become a contributor, and, as Lord Jeffrey afterwards said, "did more work for us than anybody." Having studied for the Scottish bar, he went to London, became distinguished for his fearlessness and vehement oratory, and in 1810 he entered the House of Commons and joined the Whig opposition. In 1830 Brougham was elevated to the office of Lord Chancellor, while his name was merged in that of Lord Brougham and Vaux. He held office for four years, retiring in November 1834. This was the end of his official life, but he became distinguished as an author and law reformer. He died May 7, 1868.

BURKE, EDMUND, was born in Dublin, on January 12, 1730. His education was completed at Trinity College. He went to London about 1750, and commenced miscellaneous literary work. He first projected the *Annual Register*, and wrote the whole of it himself for some years. His first connection with politics was his employment as private secretary to the Marquis of Rockingham in 1765. His first speech in the House of Commons was on the Stamp Act, which Lord Rockingham had brought in a bill to repeal. Burke's influence was fully exemplified in British politics from 1765 to 1797. His views on domestic politics are contained in his "Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontent," 1770, and from two speeches delivered at Bristol, 1774 and 1780. The two of his greatest speeches are those on "American Taxation," 1774, and on "Conciliation with America," in 1775. Sir Samuel Romilly considered his speech at Bristol previous to the election as the best piece of oratory in the language. Burke also delivered some great speeches on the government of India, of which the best known are "Mr Fox's East India Bill," 1783, "On the Nabob of Arcot's Debts," 1785 (this latter Lord Brougham considered his greatest oration), and the several speeches in the impeachment of Warren Hastings. His celebrated "Reflections on the French Revolution" were published in 1790. Burke died in 1797, at Beaconsfield, broken-hearted at his son's death. "The peculiar effect of Burke," says Mr Payne, "is to enlarge, strengthen, liberalise, and ennoble the understanding." An able and sympathetic study of Burke's life and speeches by Rev F. D. Maurice will be found on page 418.

CANNING, GEORGE, was the son of an Irishman of considerable literary ability, and born in London, April 11, 1770. He was sent to Hyde Abbey School, Winchester, and afterwards went to Eton, where he distinguished himself as a scholar, and formed many friendships which were afterwards of great value to him. He contributed to a periodical called the *Microcosm* while at Eton. He distinguished himself also at Oxford, and afterwards entered Lincoln's Inn. Through the influence of Pitt, who had introduced him to the House of Commons, he received an Under-Secretaryship of State, and this, along with his marriage to Miss Joanna Scott, who possessed a fortune of £100,000, placed him in easy circumstances. He was promoted Foreign Secretary after the death of Pitt, and after the ministry of Fox and Grenville had been dissolved. Owing to a duel with Lord Castlereagh, both statesmen were obliged to quit office. In 1812 he became member for Liverpool, and in April 1827 he reached the summit of his ambition, and was placed at the head of the administration. He did not long survive after his elevation, dying on the 8th of August, at the age of fifty-seven.

CARLYLE, THOMAS, one of the most original of our modern writers and thinkers, was born at Ecclefechan, in Dumfriesshire, on the 4th December 1795. He attended first the parish school of Ecclefechan, and afterwards that of Annan. In 1809 he came to study at the Edinburgh University. His habits at this time are said to have been lonely and contemplative, and his reading in all kinds of literature assiduous and extensive. In 1818 he returned to Edinburgh, became a contributor to the "Edinburgh Encyclopædia," and also made a translation of "Legendre's Geometry." In 1823 he acted as tutor to Charles Buller. He published a translation of Goethe's "Wilhelm Meister" in 1824, and his other great works followed in succession. From the year of his marriage with a daughter of Dr Welsh of Haddington in 1826, till 1834, he resided at Craigenputtoch, a retired farm-house about fifteen miles from Dumfries. In 1834 he removed to London, settling at Chelsea, where he resided till his death in 1881. In 1837 he lectured on "German Literature," in Willis's Rooms, London: in 1839 he lectured on the

"Revolutions of Modern Europe," and in 1840 on "Hero-Worship." This was his last public appearance in this capacity, with the exception of his rectorial address to the Edinburgh students in 1866, which is given entire in this volume.

CHALMERS, THOMAS, the distinguished Scottish divine, was born at Anstruther, in the county of Fife, March 17, 1780. During his college career at St Andrews he showed a strong liking for the study of mathematics, and acted for some time as assistant mathematical teacher at St Andrews. He was ordained minister of Kilmany in 1803. In addition to his labours as a parish minister he showed activity in other departments of work. He lectured on chemistry in several parts of the country; he became an officer in a volunteer corps; besides publishing a work on the resources of the country and some pamphlets. He wrote the article "Christianity" for the "Edinburgh Encyclopædia." The writing of this article impressed his whole nature more fully with the power and scope of Christianity. In 1815 he removed to St John's parish, Glasgow, where he worked unceasingly for the moral elevation of his parishioners. His fame as a preacher and orator was now established. In 1823 he removed to St Andrews, as Professor of Moral Philosophy in the United College, and in 1828 he was elected Professor of Divinity in Edinburgh University. The disruption in the Scottish Established Church took place in 1843, with which Chalmers was so nobly identified. He died May 30, 1847.

CHATHAM, WILLIAM PITT, EARL OF, was born in Cornwall in 1708, and studied at Eton and Oxford. He became a cornet of dragoons, and afterwards entered Parliament as member for Old Sarum, near Salisbury. He at once distinguished himself by his attacks on Sir Robert Walpole, and by his chaste and classical eloquence. He attacked the policy of the king, and those acts of the ministers which he thought were hostile to national liberty. The Duchess of Marlborough, in admiration for his line of conduct, and for his hostility to Walpole, bequeathed him a legacy of £10,000. In 1746, on the change of administration, he was appointed Vice-Treasurer of Ireland, and afterwards Treasurer and Paymaster of the Army, with a seat in the Privy Council. In 1754 he married into the Granville family; was dismissed from office, but again re-instated in 1757, as Secretary of State and Prime Minister. His full power and influence were now felt in Parliament, and among the ministry he carried everything before him. France was completely beaten in the four quarters of the globe. Having advised the declaration of war with Spain in 1760, and finding that Lord Bute thwarted his wishes, he resigned office in 1761, accepting a pension of £3000 a year, his wife becoming Baroness of Chatham. Sir William Pynsent also left him a vast property. He had still retained his seat in the House of Commons, and opposed the arbitrary measures which finally led to a declaration of independence on the part of the American colonies. He advocated a conciliatory policy in 1766, and the repeal of the Stamp Act, and helped in forming a new ministry. He was at this time created Viscount Burton, Baron Pynsent, and Earl of Chatham; but he resigned his new ministry in 1768. In the House of Lords he still advocated a conciliatory policy with the American colonies, and in speaking on the subject he fell down in a convulsive fit, April 7, 1778. On the 11th of May he died, and his body, after lying in state, was buried in Westminster Abbey; £4000 a year was added to the earldom, and £20,000 of his debts were paid.

CHESTERFIELD, PHILIP DORMER STANHOPE, EARL OF, was born in 1694, and studied at Trinity College, Cambridge. After some time spent in travel, he returned home to succeed his father to the earldom of Chesterfield. In 1728 he was made ambassador extraordinary to Holland, Knight of the Garter in 1730, and Steward of the Household. He distinguished himself by his great eloquence in the House, and in a periodical called the *Craftsman*. He was for a time Secretary of State, but, owing to declining health, he gave up office in 1748. Chesterfield died in 1773. He was the author of several poetical pieces in the *World;* but he is best known by his famous "Letters to his Son," of which a pleasing style and knowledge of the world is perhaps their greatest recommendation.

COBBETT, WILLIAM, was born in 1762, near Farnham, in Surrey. His childhood was spent in the occupations usual upon a farm, as his father's had been. At sixteen he attempted to make off to sea; at seventeen he went to London; at twenty-two he enlisted as a private soldier, and rose to the rank of sergeant-major. His regiment was in America for four years, when on its recall to England in 1791 he obtained his discharge. He married in 1792 and went to France, but on the outbreak of the Revolution he went to America, where he remained eight years. He now commenced his career as author and editor, and, on his return to England in 1800, published the *Porcupine* and *Weekly Register*, the latter of which was continued up till the time of his death. It appeared at first as a Tory, but became eventually a Radical publication. It abounded in violent personal and political attacks on public men. He was twice fined and prosecuted for libel, and in 1809 was fined and imprisoned in Newgate for two

years, In 1817 he went to America to avoid a prosecution under the "Six Acts Bill," where he remained two years until the Act was repealed. After the passing of the Reform Bill, he entered Parliament in 1832 as member for Oldham. He died in 1835. Besides his political writings, Cobbett wrote his "Cottage Economy," "English Grammar," "History of the Protestant Reformation," and "Rural Rides," etc. His language is uniformly forcible and vigorous, and as he himself says, "his popularity" was owing to his "giving truth in clear language."

COBDEN, RICHARD, was born at Dunford, near Midhurst, in Sussex, in 1804. He served an apprenticeship in a London warehouse, and after acting as a commercial traveller for a short time, became a partner in a cotton firm at Manchester. He all the while took a deep interest in politics, especially in the Reform Bill. As the result of a tour through Egypt, Greece, Turkey, and the United States, he in 1834 published pamphlets, entitled, "England, Ireland, and America," and "Russia." In 1838 he devoted all the energies of his nature towards the advancement of the Anti-Corn Law League. He entered Parliament as member for Stockport in 1841, where he distinguished himself, and in 1846 witnessed the repeal of the corn laws. He was elected Member of Parliament for the West Riding of Yorkshire in 1847. Lord Palmerston in 1859 offered him the presidentship of the Board of Trade, which he did not accept. A baronetcy, and a seat in the Privy Council, he also declined. He died in London, April 2, 1865.

CROMWELL, OLIVER, was born at Huntingdon, April 25, 1599. His father, Robert Cromwell, was a brewer, and a man of good property in this town. He was educated at the free school of his native city, and at Cambridge, and afterwards became a law student at Lincoln's Inn. He married Elizabeth, the daughter of Sir James Bourchier, in his twenty-first year, and settled at Huntingdon. In 1628 he was elected Member of Parliament for Huntingdon, and made his first appearance in the House in February 1629. He represented Cambridge in 1640. He was more remarkable at this time for business-like habits and energy of character than for elegance or gracefulness in delivery. In 1642 he received a commission from the Earl of Essex to raise a troop of horse at Cambridge to oppose the king, of which he had the command. He distinguished himself at Marston Moor in 1644, and soon afterwards at the great victory of Naseby. He defeated the Scots at Preston in 1648, and took the town of Berwick. He signed the warrant for the execution of Charles I. In August 1649, he was named Lord-Lieutenant and Commander-in-Chief in Ireland, when he subdued many of the northern towns there. The great battle of Dunbar took place on the 3d September 1650, when the Scots were totally defeated; and Edinburgh and Perth were shortly afterwards in his power. He again defeated the army of Prince Charles at Worcester on the 3d September 1651. In 1653 he had a new parliament formed, which resigned its power into his hands under the title of "Lord Protector." Worn out by care and anxiety, and sorrow at the death of his favourite daughter, Elizabeth Claypole, he died September 3, 1658, the anniversary of the victories of Dunbar and Worcester.

CURRAN, JOHN PHILPOT, was of humble origin, and born near Cork in 1750. Educated at Trinity College, Dublin, he went to London, and studied law in the Temple. At first he met with great difficulties in his career, but his talent for defence and debate soon caused him to be distinguished. He was a member of the Irish House of Commons in 1784, and on the Whigs coming into office in 1806, he was made Master of the Rolls in Ireland. He held this office till 1814, when he received a pension of £3000, after which time he for the most part resided in London. He died in 1817.

DERBY, EDWARD GEOFFREY STANLEY, EARL OF, K.G., etc., was born in 1799, at Knowsley Park, Lancashire. He was educated at Eton, and at Christ Church, Oxford. He became a member of the House of Commons in 1821 for Stockbridge, and in 1826 for Preston. Under Canning he became Under-Secretary for the Colonies. In 1832 he was distinguished in debate on the Reform Bill, and about this time carried a measure for national education in Ireland. After being in and out of office several times, he in 1841 became Colonial Secretary, a post which he occupied for four years. In 1852, now Earl of Derby, he constructed a Conservative cabinet, and amongst other things carried measures of Chancery reform, and passed the Militia Bill. In 1852 he resigned, but again held office as Premier in 1858-59. He died in 1869.

DICKENS, CHARLES, one of England's most popular novelists, has also excelled in after-dinner oratory, and in the delivery of neat, pointed, and seasonable speeches, from which a selection is presented in the present volume. He was born at Landport, Portsmouth, on the 7th February 1812. He was educated first at a private school at Chatham, and afterwards at a good school in or near London. His father sent him to the office of a solicitor. He soon afterwards acted as reporter for some time for a publication entitled the *Mirror of Parliament*. He afterwards obtained a situation as reporter for the *Morning Chronicle*. Messrs Chapman & Hall engaged him to write a story in monthly parts. The result was the popular and well-known "Pickwick Papers," which had an enormous sale. Work after work flowed

from his pen, with no diminution but rather increase to his popularity. He also appeared as a public reader of his own works in America, also in London, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and many important provincial towns. He had commenced a new novel, "The Mystery of Edwin Drood," but death found him busy at his task, and called him away ere the mystery for the public was solved. He died at his residence, Gad's Hill, of effusion of blood on the brain, brought on by over-work, 9th June 1870, and was buried in Westminster Abbey, 14th June 1870. Inclusive of reprinted pieces, Mr Dickens has had to do with upwards of forty separate volumes.

DISRAELI, THE RIGHT HON. BENJAMIN, LORD BEACONSFIELD, was the oldest son of Isaac Disraeli, author of the "Curiosities of Literature," and was born in London, 21st December 1805. The first appearance of the Disraeli family in England was in the shape of a Venetian convert from Judaism, who came to this country in 1748, was successful in business, and settled down in retirement at Enfield, Middlesex. His only son Isaac was the father of Lord Beaconsfield. He was articled in a solicitor's office, and while very young published "Vivian Grey," a novel, which was followed afterwards by "The Young Duke," "Henrietta Temple," and others. He henceforth devoted himself to politics and literature. In 1837 he entered Parliament as member for Maidstone, which was exchanged for Shrewsbury in 1841. He obtained a seat for Buckinghamshire in 1847, which he continued to represent up till 1876. At the death of Lord G. Bentinck he became the acknowledged leader of the Conservatives in the House of Commons. Under Lord Derby he acted as Chancellor of the Exchequer from February to December 1852, from February 1858 to June 1859, and from July 1866 to February 1868. He acted as First Lord of the Treasury till 8th December 1868. In 1866, while Chancellor of the Exchequer, he brought forward his Reform Bill, which was passed, giving a great extension to the franchise. In 1868 the Conservatives were defeated at the general election, and with Mr Gladstone as Premier, the bill for the disestablishment of the Irish Church was carried in spite of strong opposition. On Mr Gladstone s appeal to the country in 1874, the result was that 351 Conservative members and 302 Liberals were returned to Parliament. Mr Gladstone resigned, and Mr Disraeli became Prime Minister at the head of the Conservative Government. He was a D.C.L. of Oxford and Edinburgh, a Privy Councillor, a trustee of the British Museum, a trustee of the National Gallery, a Deputy-Lieutenant of Bucks, and a Royal Commissioner in Exhibition of 1851. He was chosen Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow in 1873, and again re-elected in 1874. He accepted a seat in the House of Lords with the title of Lord Beaconsfield. His novel "Lothair," has been warmly praised by some as displaying sound Protestant principles. Mr Disraeli in 1839 married a wealthy lady, Mrs Lewis, widow of Wyndham Lewis, Esq., M.P. She was created Viscountess Beaconsfield in her own right on 30th November 1868, and died 15th December 1872, leaving no family. Disraeli died 19th April 1881.

DODDRIDGE, PHILIP, a dissenting divine, was born in London in 1702. He was successively minister at Kibworth, Market Harborough, and Northampton. He had a great and deserved reputation as a preacher, though his voice is said to have been unmelodious. He went to Lisbon for the benefit of his health, being troubled with a pulmonary complaint, and died there in 1751. His most popular works are "The Family Expositor," "The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul," which has had an immense sale, and to which John Foster prefaced a remarkable essay, the "Life of Colonel Gardiner," and "Hymns."

DONNE, JOHN, was born in London in 1573. Although brought up in the Catholic faith, after completing his studies at Oxford he embraced Protestantism, and became secretary to the Lord Chancellor Ellesmere. Here he lost office, was imprisoned for clandestinely marrying the niece of the chancellor, afterwards took orders, was made one of the chaplains to King James, and became preacher of Lincoln's Inn and Dean of St Paul's. He also wrote poetry, and became what Dr Johnson styles the founder of the metaphysical school of poetry. Dean Alford says there are passages in his writings which "in depth and grandeur even surpass the strings of beautiful expressions to be found in Jeremy Taylor, and are the recreations of a loftier mind."

ELIOT, SIR JOHN, was born in 1590 at Port Eliot, in Cornwall. He entered Oxford University at the age of fifteen, where he remained for three years, but left without taking a degree. He travelled on the Continent, married on his return to England, and was elected Member of Parliament in 1614. About 1618 he was appointed vice-admiral for Devon. Eliot sat in the first, second, and third parliaments of Charles I., and was the recognised leader of the "Opposition." In the opposition of forced loans, in the procuring the Petition of Right, and in the impeachment of Buckingham, he especially distinguished himself. He was more than once imprisoned for his freedom of speech and his refusal to pay the forced loan, and on the last occasion lay in the Tower till his death, which took place in November 1632. Mr John

Forster has written the completest and best biography of this great patriot and statesman, based on original papers first discovered by him at Port Eliot.

ERSKINE, THOMAS, LORD, was the third son of David Henry Erskine, Earl of Buchan, and was born about 1750. He was educated at Edinburgh High School and St Andrews University, went to sea for four years as a midshipman, and afterwards entered the Royals, or 1st Regiment of Foot. At the age of twenty-six he became a student at Trinity College, Cambridge, and about the same time began to study law at Lincoln's Inn. In 1778 he was called to the bar, and was at once successful. In 1783 he entered Parliament as member for Portsmouth. In 1792 he defended Thomas Paine in his prosecution for the second part of his "Rights of Man." He was for this action deprived of his office as Attorney-General to the Prince of Wales. He took a very prominent part in the trials of Hardy, Tooke, and others, for high treason in 1794. He was restored to his office of Attorney-General in 1802, and on the death of Pitt in 1806 he was promoted to the dignity of Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain. On the dissolution of the ministry with which he was connected, he retired with a pension. He died in 1823.

FOX, CHARLES JAMES, was the son of Henry Fox, first Lord Holland, and was born January 13, 1748. He was educated at Westminster, Eton, and Oxford, and distinguished himself in the department of classical literature. His father secured him a seat in Parliament for the borough of Midhurst when he was only nineteen; this he did not accept until of a legal age. In 1770 he was created one of the Lords of the Admiralty, and in 1773 he was nominated a Commissioner of the Treasury, but, owing to a disagreement with Lord North, was dismissed. He was appointed one of the Secretaries of State in 1782, but resigned on the death of the Marquis of Rockingham. His India Bill, after passing the Commons, was thrown out by the Lords, which caused the dissolution of the ministry with which he was identified. Fox placed himself at the head of the Opposition against Pitt. He visited the Continent in 1788; and on Pitt's death was again called to power. He died 13th September 1806, in the fifty-ninth year of his age.

FROUDE, JAMES ANTHONY, was born at Dartington, Devonshire, April 23, 1818. He was educated at Oriel College, Oxford, and in 1842 was elected a fellow of Exeter College. Under the Rev. J. H. Newman, he was connected with the High Church party, and contributed to a work entitled "The Lives of the English Saints." In 1844 he took deacon's orders. Two books which he published in 1847-49, entitled "The Shadows of the Clouds," and "The Nemesis of Faith," received the severe reprobation of the university authorities. He resigned his orders as a deacon, but afterwards returned to the communion of the Church of England as a layman. Mr Froude has acted as editor for some time, and largely as a contributor, to *Fraser's Magazine;* he has also contributed to the *Westminster Review.* His most important works, however, are his "History of England, from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada," "The English in Ireland during the Eighteenth Century," and "Short Studies on Great Subjects," 3 vols. He was installed Rector of St Andrews University in 1869, and a masterly and thoughtful lecture on education (p. 511) was delivered on that occasion. The degree of LL.D. was also conferred upon him at this time. In 1872 he lectured in the United States of America on the relations between England and America. At the close of 1874 he was sent by the Earl of Carnarvon, Secretary of State, to the colonies, Cape of Good Hope, to make inquiries regarding the Caffre insurrection. He returned to London in March 1875. Mr Froude delivered the opening address of the winter session of the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution in 1876, taking as his subject "The Uses of a Landed Gentry."

FULLER, THOMAS, was born at All Winkle, Northamptonshire, in 1608. At the age of twelve, his father, who was rector of that parish, sent him to Cambridge, where he took the degree of Master of Arts in 1628. He became prebend of Salisbury and vicar of Broad Windsor at the age of twenty-three. His "Holy War" and "Pisgah-Sight of Palestine" were written about this time. He afterwards became a chaplain in the Royalist army, and while wandering about from place to place was collecting materials for his "Worthies of England." He left the army in 1644, and retired to Exeter, and during this retirement wrote his "Good Thoughts in Bad Times." He was in London living in a small lodging when Charles I. was executed. He was, however, allowed liberty to preach by Cromwell, and on the Restoration was made chaplain extraordinary to Charles II., and Doctor of Divinity by the University of Cambridge. He died on Sunday, August 12, 1661.

GLADSTONE, THE RIGHT HON. WILLIAM EWART, was born at Liverpool, on the 29th December 1809. He is the fourth son of the late Sir John Gladstone, Bart. of Fasque, county of Kincardine, a Liverpool merchant. In one of his speeches he casually remarked that his mother was of Highland extraction, and that his father was a native of Roxburghshire. He studied at Eton and Christ Church, Oxford, and after some time spent in Continental travel, he entered (1832) the House of Commons as member for

Newark in the Conservative interest. Sir Robert Peel, early recognising his business and administrative talent, in the autumn of 1834 appointed him Under-Secretary for the Colonies. In the revision of the British tariff in 1842, his explanation and defence of the policy of the Government, and his complete mastery of its details, led to its being passed almost without alteration in both Houses. In 1851 he left the Conservative, and has ever since appeared on the Liberal side. He has held office as follows: Vice-President of the Board of Trade, and Master of the Mint, from September 1841 to May 1843; President of the Board of Trade from May 1843 to February 1845; Secretary of State for the Colonies, July 1846; Chancellor of the Exchequer, in Lord Aberdeen's ministry, December 28th, 1852; resigned along with the Aberdeen ministry January 30th, 1855; held the same office under Lord Palmerston February 5th, resigned February 21st, 1855; held office as Chancellor of the Exchequer from June 18th, 1859, to July 5th, 1866; represented South Lancashire in Parliament from 1865 to 1868; was elected for Greenwich in November 1868, and was elected First Lord of the Treasury on 8th December of the same year. In 1868 he was Premier, and carried the bill for the disestablishment of the Irish Church in the same year. Along with his party he demitted office in 1874, and he resigned his leadership of the Liberal party early in 1875. He was again in office, 1880–85. He is noted as a fluent, clear-headed, perspicuous orator, uniting the abilities of a first-rate financier with those of the orator, showing a wonderful grasp and mastery of the details of public business. "Whilst the classic grace of his speeches," says an anonymous writer, "may preserve them, like the orations of Cicero, to mould the utterances of statesmen in far distant ages, their fulness of thought, breadth of conception, far-reaching human sympathies, and moral splendour of purpose, will give to them, like the 'Republic' of Plato, a power, which the centuries cannot exhaust, over the nobles among men and women, quickening their resolves to create, as much as in them lies, the rule of righteousness on earth." He has published "The Church Considered in its Relations with the State," a translation of Homer in three volumes, "Juventis Mundi," a critique on "Ecce Homo," and a multitude of articles in the *Contemporary Review*, with separate pamphlets on important questions of the day. His pamphlet on the Bulgarian atrocities had an enormous circulation. Mr Gladstone has also appeared to advantage as a letter-writer.

GOUGH, JOHN B., was born at Sandgate, Kent, in 1817. In 1829 he was sent to America along with another family, who were leaving his village at the same time. He spent two years in Oneida county, and going to New York he followed the trade of a bookbinder. Falling into drunken habits he suddenly reformed. He began to speak in public on temperance subjects, and his fame as an orator spread abroad. He visited the Southern States and Canada; in the Northern States, in Massachusetts, in the course of two years he travelled 12,000 miles, delivered 605 lectures, and induced 31,760 persons to sign the pledge. He visited England in 1853, lecturing with powerful effect in Exeter Hall, London, and in various parts of the country. He went back to America, working with increased popularity and success. In 1857 he visited England again, returning to the United States in 1860. He died at Frankford, Pennsylvania, February 18, 1886.

GRATTAN, HENRY, was born at Dublin about the year 1750. He was called to the bar in 1772, and obtained a seat in the Irish Parliament three years later. One of the great objects Grattan had in view, during his brilliant and useful career, was the complete independence of the Irish Parliament. Contrary to the advice of his friends, but with the voice of the nation in his favour, he made, on the 19th of April 1780, his memorable motion in the Irish House for a declaration of Irish Right. His speech on that occasion was the most splendid piece of eloquence that had ever been heard in Ireland. As an expression of their gratitude for his services, the Parliament of Ireland voted the sum of £100,000 to purchase him an estate, and he finally agreed to accept one-half the amount. Died 1820.

GREY, CHARLES, EARL, was born at Fallowden, near Alnwick, March 15, 1764. He was educated at Eton, and at King's College, Cambridge, and at the age of twenty-one entered Parliament as member for Northumberland in the Whig interest. He acted as one of the managers in the impeachment of Warren Hastings, and was strenuously opposed to the measures brought forward by Pitt. He was in office under C. J. Fox, and at his death he became Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. In 1830 he became Prime Minister, and under his four years' administration the important measures for parliamentary reform and the abolition of slavery were passed. He died July 17, 1845.

GUTHRIE, REV. THOMAS, D.D., was the son of a merchant and banker, and born at Brechin, Forfarshire, July 12, 1803. He studied with a view to the ministry of the Church of Scotland at Edinburgh University, and, on being licensed to preach, went to Paris, where he walked the hospitals, and gained some knowledge of medicine. On his return to Brechin he acted as clerk in his father's banking house for some time, and in 1830 he was ordained to the parish of Arbirlot. In his quiet country charge, not far from the sea-side, he carried

out those reforms, such as establishing a penny bank, which were a feature in his after-career, and gathered in those influences, and stored his mind with those images, which were afterwards destined to adorn and illustrate his speeches, lectures, and sermons. Here he also began and continued that careful elaboration of his sermons which, with his vivid imagination and quick sympathy, told so well afterwards in the pulpit. He was translated to Old Greyfriars, Edinburgh, in 1837, and in 1840 to St John's Parish Church. He took a prominent part in the disruption in the Scottish Church of 1843, and cast in his lot with the Free Church. During 1845-46 his work was incessant and laborious, on behalf of the manse fund for his denomination, for which £116,370, 14s. 1d. was in a short time raised throughout the country. He was now one of the most popular and eloquent ministers in Scotland. The publication of his "Pleas for Ragged Schools" led to the founding and support of ragged schools in Edinburgh. In 1864 he accepted the editorship of the *Sunday Magazine*, which bore the stamp of his manifold philanthropy and catholic spirit. He died at St Leonards, February 24, 1873.

HALL, JOSEPH, was born at Ashby-de-la-Zouch in 1574, was educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and afterwards became Dean of Worcester. About 1627 he accepted the bishopric of Exeter, but removed to the see of Norwich in 1641. Along with twelve other prelates he protested against any laws being passed in Parliament during their forced absence from the House, for which they were sent to the Tower. He was released in June 1642, but afterwards suffered various petty persecutions from the Puritans, who plundered his house, and despoiled the cathedral. His estate was also sequestered, and although reduced to poverty, he continued to preach occasionally. He died in 1656. His "Meditations" is his best known work. Though, as it has been remarked, his pages abound in conceits and sententious passages, yet they rise at times to the very highest eloquence, attesting at the same time the piety and sincerity of his nature.

HALL, REV. ROBERT, was the son of a Baptist minister, and born at Arnsby, near Leicester, May 2, 1764. He studied at a Baptist academy, Bristol, and in 1780 was admitted preacher. In 1781 he attended Aberdeen University, where he met Sir James Mackintosh, when a close friendship sprang up between them. He became assistant in a Baptist chapel, Bristol, and shortly afterwards removed to Cambridge. He became celebrated as a writer, and an eloquent and spirit-stirring speaker. His chief works were published between 1791 and 1804, when his intellect became deranged. On his recovery he became pastor of a church at Leicester, where he resided for twenty years. He removed to Bristol in 1826, where he officiated in a Baptist congregation there till shortly before his death, which took place on February 21, 1831. His eloquence has been described as weighty, impressive, and entrancing, and his published sermons have been looked upon as among the most valuable contributions to theological literature.

HAMILTON, JOHN, OF BIEL, LORD BELHAVEN, was born 5th July 1656. For opposing the Test Act he was committed to the castle of Edinburgh, but shortly afterwards he was released, and resumed his sitting in Parliament. He was present at the convention of Scottish nobility in London, Jan. 1689, and contributed towards the settling of the crown upon William, Prince of Orange, and Mary. He was made a member of Privy Council, and commissioner for executing the office of lord-register. He commanded a troop of horse at the battle of Killiecrankie, 27th July 1689, and was for some time one of the farmers of the poll-tax and excise. Under Queen Anne he was continued a Privy Councillor. His speech opposing the Treaty of Union was a display of mistaken zeal, but in matter and manner it was eloquent, nervous, and pathetic. He was accomplished in most branches of the learning of the time, had a good memory, which, in speaking, enabled him to draw parallels between the past and present history of the country. He was taken prisoner to London on suspicion of favouring the Pretender, and was led in triumph through the capital. His high spirit could not brook this disgrace, and he died June 21, 1708, immediately on his release from prison, of inflammation of the brain. (Abridged from Douglas's "Peerage of Scotland.")

HOOKER, RICHARD, was born at Heavitree, near Exeter, Devonshire, about 1553. He studied at the University of Oxford, and in 1577 was elected a fellow of Corpus Christi College. He took orders in 1581, married soon afterwards, and took the living of Drayton Beauchamp, in Bucks. His marriage is said to have been productive of little domestic felicity. He was appointed Master of the Temple in 1585, which he afterwards exchanged for the living of Boscombe, in Wiltshire. In 1595 he was presented by the Crown to Bishopsborne, in Kent, where he died in 1600, aged forty-seven. His great work on the "Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity" is a defence of the polity and ritual of the Church of England against the attacks of the Puritans. It contains passages of great majesty and grandeur of diction.

IRVING, REV. EDWARD, was born, August 15, 1792, at Annan, in Scotland, where his father was a tanner. He was educated at the

University of Edinburgh, and took the degree of M.A. He assisted during 1811 in a mathematical school at Haddington, and at Kirkcaldy he became rector of an academy. In 1815 he was licensed as a preacher. He acted as assistant to Dr Chalmers in Glasgow for three years, when he received a unanimous call to a Presbyterian Chapel in Cross Street, Hatton Garden. An empty church was speedily filled, and the rank, fashion, and talent of the time were all represented in his crowded audiences. The chapel, which, at his arrival, did not count more than fifty hearers, had, at the end of three months, 1500 applicants for sittings. A new church was built in Regent Square, capable of accommodating at least 2000 persons. A charge of heresy was brought against Irving at a meeting of the Presbytery of London, November 20, 1830. Among other religious extravagances which he had introduced, was that of speaking in unknown tongues, which had originated among some females in Glasgow, and which had been transferred to his own church. The finding of the presbytery being against him, the trustees of the church in Regent Square deposed him in 1832. He was deposed from the ministry by the Presbytery of Annan in 1833. Irving had caught cold on a journey to Scotland, which developed into consumption, and he died on the evening of Sunday, December 6, 1834, and was buried in the crypt of Glasgow Cathedral.

JEWELL, JOHN, Bishop of Salisbury, was born in 1522, at the village of Buden, near Ilfracombe, Devonshire. He studied at Oxford, and in 1546 openly professed the faith of the Reformers. On the accession of Queen Mary, while holding the living of Summingwell, Berks, he was obliged to escape to the Continent to avoid persecution as a heretic. While abroad, he became vice-master of a school at Strasburg. He returned to England on the death of Mary, and was raised to the bishopric of Salisbury in 1560. He died in 1571. His chief work is entitled "An Apology for the Church of England," which did much in promoting the cause of the Reformation.

KINGSLEY, CHARLES, poet, novelist, earnest moral reformer, and vigorous preacher, was born in Devonshire, June 12, 1819. He became the pupil of the Rev. Derwent Coleridge when fourteen years of age, and afterwards studied at Cambridge, where he distinguished himself in classics and mathematics. While his father held the living of Clovelly, on the Devonshire coast, he studied conchology; and at Helston grammar school he threw himself eagerly into the study of botany, when a pupil under the Rev. Charles A. Johns. At Cambridge he was exceedingly popular, and a good deal of his time was spent in boxing, boating, and riding, and studying by fits and starts. An attachment formed about this time with his future wife, a daughter of Mr Grenfell, for some time M.P. for Truro and Great Marlow, acted as a powerful stimulus upon him. Another daughter of Mr Grenfell's became the wife of J. A. Froude, the historian. He was appointed curate of Eversley, in Hampshire, in 1842, and two years later he settled down there with his young wife. The state of the parish was deplorable; although kindly and intelligent, few of the adult population could read or write; and there was no school. He addressed himself most enthusiastically and unweariedly to the task of teaching, and preaching, and visiting amongst his parishioners, and in not a few cases he also acted as a doctor. In visiting amongst the poor, he not only understood, but helped them. He preached and taught much regarding the laws of health, and the necessity of draining and ventilation. At home he was bright and laughter-loving, abroad he fed both eye and mind with the sights and sounds and forms of nature. He was a true friend and a marvellous correspondent. Besides his contributions to current literature from time to time, his more important books are several volumes of sermons, the well-known novels "Alton Locke," "Yeast," "Hypatia," "Westward Ho!" etc.; also some beautiful lyrics which may be expected to take a permanent place in literature. He was associated in 1850 with Archdeacon Hare, F. D. Maurice, and Ludlow, in carrying on the *Christian Socialist*. In 1859 he was made one of the Queen's chaplains-in-ordinary, and in 1860 elected Professor of Modern History at Cambridge. This professorship he resigned in 1869, when he was made a canon of Chester. In 1873 he was made a canon of Westminster Abbey. He visited America in 1874, caught a cold in travelling, which did not leave him on his return to England, and died at Eversley, January 23, 1875.

KNOX, JOHN, was a native of Gifford, in East Lothian, where he was born in 1505. After attending the grammar school of Haddington, he was sent to the University of Glasgow, and in due time was ordained to the priesthood. He made a formal avowal of Protestantism in the year 1542. Knox repaired to St Andrews, taught the new faith, exercised the functions of a Christian pastor, and for the first time publicly in Scotland dispensed the sacrament of the Lord's Supper after the primitive and Protestant form. On the reduction of the castle, he was conveyed a prisoner to Rouen, where he was confined in the galleys for a period of nineteen months, at the end of which time he was liberated, and repaired to England. During a two years' exile in Geneva, where he acted for some time as pastor, Knox and the English exiles completed the English version of the Scriptures, commonly called the Geneva Bible. Meanwhile changes favourable to the Reformation had been taking place in Scotland,

and Knox, having been invited to return, left Geneva, and landed at Leith in 1559. Knox was afterwards formally ordained minister of Edinburgh in 1560. He now pursued with ceaseless zeal the work of the Reformation, and came into collision with Queen Mary on her arrival in Scotland. When the queen's party gained strength, he retired to St Andrews, but again returned to Edinburgh, where he died, 24th November 1572, and was buried in St Giles'.

LATIMER, HUGH, was born of humble though worthy parentage, in 1490 or 1491, at Thurcaston, in Leicestershire. At fourteen years of age Latimer was sent to the University of Cambridge, where he was remarkable for "sanctimony of life," and his studious habits. He was at first a zealous Papist, but, through the influence of Bilney, "began to smell the Word of God, and forsook the school doctors and such fooleries." But his zeal in the new doctrines alarmed the doctors and friars, who endeavoured to prohibit his preaching. Cardinal Wolsey favoured him, however, and gave him licence to preach throughout England. He was one of the delegates appointed to determine the validity of Henry VIII.'s marriage with Catherine of Arragon, and preached before the king on the day on which the decree of the senate was presented. He was afterwards appointed chaplain to Anne Boleyn, and presented to the living of West Kington, in Wiltshire. The bishopric of Worcester was conferred upon him in August 1535, but he was obliged to resign the same in 1539. He had been twice imprisoned, when, on the accession of Edward VI., he was set free in 1547. On the accession of Queen Mary he was again committed to prison, and, after remaining six months in the Tower, was taken to Oxford, along with Cranmer and Ridley, for the purpose of holding examinations and disputations concerning heresy. The result was that all the three prelates were excommunicated, condemned, and committed to separate confinement. After sixteen months' imprisonment, Latimer and Ridley were tried for heresy, and sentenced to death. Latimer and Ridley were publicly burnt in front of Balliol College, on the 16th of October 1555. Latimer's brave, prophetical words, spoken on this occasion, are well known: "Be of good comfort, Master Ridley, and play the man; we shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out."

LEIGHTON, ROBERT, Archbishop of Glasgow, was born in London in 1613. He was educated at Edinburgh, and, after some years spent abroad, he was ordained minister of Newbattle, about eight miles from Edinburgh. He left the Presbyterian Church, became an Episcopalian, and was successively promoted to be Principal of Edinburgh University, Bishop of Dunblane, and Archbishop of Glasgow. About 1673 he retired from his see and settled in the south of England. He died at London in 1684. His works are still widely read, and recommended for their genuine piety and true devotional feeling.

LYNDHURST, JOHN SINGLETON COPLEY, BARON, was born at Boston, U.S., May 21st, 1772. At first intended for a painter, he attended the lectures given by Reynolds and Barry, and afterwards went to the University of Cambridge, where he took the degree of B.A. and M.A. He studied law, and was called to the bar in 1804. In 1818 he entered Parliament as member for Yarmouth, Isle of Wight. In 1818 he was named Solicitor-General and was knighted. In 1823 he succeeded to the post of Attorney-General. In April 1827 he was appointed to succeed Lord Eldon as Chancellor, and he was raised to the peerage. During the Grey ministry he held office as Chief Baron of Exchequer. In 1834 he was again Chancellor, but retired when the Peel ministry came into power. He oppcsed the Reform Bill, and the Municipal Corporations Bill, and became the leader of the Tory party in the House of Lords. He had occupied the woolsack three times, when he retired in 1846. "Clearness, simplicity, singular accuracy of expression, distinctness and melody of voice, and the most consummate ease, were the striking characteristics of his oratory." He died in London, October 12th, 1863, in his ninety-second year.

LYTTON, EDWARD GEORGE EARLE LYTTON BULWER, though better known as an accomplished and versatile poet and novelist, has yet some claim from the chastened elegance of his speeches to the title of orator. He was born in 1805, and educated at Cambridge, commencing his literary career in 1826 by the publication of a volume of poems called "Weeds and Wild Flowers." His first work of fiction was entitled "Falkland," and was published anonymously. "Pelham" followed in 1828, and its success decided his career as a novelist and man of letters. He afterwards published a long series of popular and well-known novels, and several volumes of graceful poetry, and some dramas. He entered Parliament in 1831, as member for St Ives, and joined the Whig party. In 1852 he was returned for Herts, and, joining the Conservative party, became Colonial Secretary in 1858. He succeeded to the Knebworth estates in 1844, worth £12,000 a year, and from this time adopted his mother's maiden name Lytton, and became known as Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton. He was created a baronet in 1835, and in 1854 was installed as honorary president to the associated societies of the University of Edinburgh, and in

1856 was installed as Lord Rector of the Glasgow University for a second time. He was raised to the peerage as Baron Lytton in 1866. He died at Knebworth in 1873.

MACAULAY, THOMAS BABINGTON (Lord Macaulay), was born at Rothley Temple, Leicestershire, October 25, 1800. Young Macaulay graduated at Cambridge, was the author of two prize poems, was elected to the Craven scholarship in 1821, and became a fellow of Trinity College in 1822. In February 1826 he was called to the bar at Lincoln's Inn. In the same year he commenced his brilliant career as an essayist by the publication of the paper on Milton in the *Edinburgh Review*, written when twenty-five years of age. He was next appointed Commissioner of Bankruptcy, and was returned as Member of Parliament for Calne in 1830. In 1834 he visited India, as a member and legal adviser of the Supreme Council, to draw up a new code of Indian law, and as one of the results of this visit, afterwards contributed his two famous essays to the *Edinburgh Review* on Lord Clive and Warren Hastings. In 1839 he was made Secretary of War, and in 1840 he was elected M.P. for Edinburgh. In 1857 he was raised to the peerage under the title of Baron Macaulay of Rothley. The state of his health forbidding his taking part in the public business in the House of Lords, his time was mainly devoted to the writing of his "History of England." Four volumes of his "History" appeared during his lifetime; the fifth, which had not received his final revision, was published after his death, which took place at Holly Lodge, in his sixtieth year, December 28, 1859. The "Life and Letters" of this great historian and brilliant speaker, by his nephew, G. Otto Trevelyan, M.P., was published in March 1876.

MACKINTOSH, SIR JAMES, was born at Aldourie House, on the banks of Loch Ness, October 24, 1765. He studied at Aberdeen and Edinburgh, and went to London for the study of law. In 1795 he was called to the bar, and in 1803 made a brilliant and famous defence of M. Peltier, a Royalist emigrant from France, who had been indicted for libel by Napoleon. He was next appointed Recorder of Bombay, was knighted, and sailed from England early in 1804. After seven years' service he returned to England, obtained a seat in Parliament, took the side of the Whigs, and received a pension of £1200 for his services in India. In 1827 he was made a Privy Councillor, and in 1830 was appointed Commissioner of Affairs for India. He died on 30th May 1832. Mackintosh was a contributor to the *Edinburgh Review* and "Encyclopædia Britannica," and was also the author of a popular "History of England" for Lardner's "Cabinet Cyclopædia."

MACLEOD, REV. NORMAN, D.D., was born at Campbeltown, Argyleshire, June 3, 1812. He studied at Edinburgh and Glasgow, and for some time acted as a private tutor. He was ordained pastor of the parish of Loudoun, Ayrshire, in 1838. He removed to Dalkeith in 1843, and to the Barony parish, Glasgow, in 1851. There he worked earnestly and unweariedly for the elevation of the people of his parish, taking a deep interest in both home and foreign missions. In 1854 he preached before the Queen at Crathie. In 1860, at the request of Mr Alexander Strahan, the well-known publisher, he undertook the editorship of *Good Words*, and some of his most popular works appeared in its pages. In 1867 he visited India as a deputation from the Church of Scotland, ostensibly to give a new impetus to mission work in India. On his return he delivered his memorable address on missions before the General Assembly. He died at his residence in Glasgow, on Sunday, June 16, 1872, universally regretted by all classes of the community.

MAURICE, THE REV. JOHN FREDERICK DENISON, was born in 1805, and was the son of a Unitarian minister. He studied at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he gained the close friendship of John Stirling. They were afterwards even more closely connected by their marriage to two sisters. Maurice left Cambridge without a degree, as he was unable to subscribe to the Thirty-Nine Articles, but he subsequently became a member of the Church of England, and took the degree of B.A. at Oxford in 1831. He was appointed chaplain and reader at Lincoln's Inn in 1846, and subsequently Theological Professor, King's College, London; but in consequence, as was said, of his views as to the eternity of future punishment, he felt obliged to resign. For a short time he acted as editor of the *Athenæum*, and published a novel called "Eustace Conway." Mr Maurice has published many volumes consisting of sermons, lectures, and addresses. The present specimen of his style and powers of thought is derived from the volume entitled "The Friendship of Books," published by Messrs Macmillan & Co., and which deserves to be widely known. He died in 1872, and was buried in Highgate Cemetery, London. Charles Kingsley, all along one of his warm admirers, paid a loving tribute to his memory.

MURRAY, WILLIAM, first Earl of Mansfield, was born at Scone Castle, near Perth, March 2, 1705. He was sent to England, where his education was completed at Westminster School and at Oxford. When called to the bar business flowed in upon him. He was appointed Solicitor-General in 1743, and was at the same time elected a Member of Parliament, where he distinguished himself on the Tory side of the

House. He became Attorney-General in 1754, and was afterwards created a peer and raised to the bench as Chief-Justice of England. In 1776 he was created Earl of Mansfield. He died in 1793.

O'CONNELL, DANIEL, was the son of a landed proprietor in the county of Kerry, born August 6, 1775. He was educated at the Catholic College of St Omer, and at the Irish Seminary of Douay. He became a student at Lincoln's Inn in 1794, and was admitted as barrister in 1798. In 1809 he identified himself with the cause of Catholic emancipation. In 1823 he helped to found a new Catholic association. The Roman Catholic Relief Bill was carried by the Lords and Commons in 1829, after many years of agitation. In the same year he represented the county of Clare in Parliament. He was elected Lord Mayor of Dublin in 1841. O'Connell took an active part in the public agitation for a repeal of the Union government. For this he was sentenced by Government to pay a fine of £2000, and to be imprisoned for a year. This judgment was afterwards reversed by the House of Lords, but his influence and power were on the wane. Retiring from political strife he commenced a pilgrimage towards Rome, and reaching Genoa died there in his seventy-second year.

PALMERSTON, LORD, HENRY JOHN TEMPLE, third Viscount Palmerston, was born at Westminster, October 20, 1784. He was educated at Harrow School, at Edinburgh, and at St John's College, Cambridge. Choosing a political career, he graduated M.A. in 1806, and offered himself as a candidate for the University of Cambridge in 1806, afterwards in 1807, but was defeated both times, but finally succeeded in 1811, when he represented the university in Parliament for the next twenty years. His first official post was that of Lord of the Admiralty, and in 1809, under the ministry of the Right Hon. Spencer Perceval, he was appointed Secretary of War, an office which he held for about twenty years through all the changes of Government. In November 1830, on the formation of a Whig ministry, he became Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, a post which he filled, with one short exception, till September 1841. In 1855 he became Prime Minister, and successfully carried out the policy of alliance with France, and the war with Russia, which ended with the fall of Sebastopol, September 1855. Lord Derby was minister for a short time, but Palmerston was restored in 1859, and held it till his death in 1865.

PEEL, SIR ROBERT, BART., was born February 5, 1788. He was educated at Harrow and Oxford, and proved himself a diligent and distinguished student. In 1809 he entered Parliament as member for Cashel. His ability as a speaker and worker was soon made apparent; he held many important public offices one after the other. At first he appeared a devoted adherent of the Tory party, but in 1829 he introduced and carried through the bill for the removal of Catholic disabilities, which he had previously opposed. He opposed the Reform Bill introduced by the Grey administration in 1830. He acted as Prime Minister in 1834 and 1839. In 1841 he was again at the head of affairs, and continued in office till 1846. In that same year he succeeded in passing a measure for the repeal of the corn laws, which were abolished in June 1846, and free trade adopted as the policy of the country. Besides this noble achievement, he will ever be remembered also as the statesman and reformer who amended the criminal code, introduced an effective system of police, and a valuable system of currency. He died on July 2, 1850, from the effects of a fall from his horse.

PITT, WILLIAM, second son of the Earl of Chatham, was born at Hayes, in Kent, May 28, 1759. He first represented the borough of Appleby, and opposed the ministry. When only twenty-three years of age, he was appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer. On the failure of Fox's India Bill, Pitt, then only in his twenty-fourth year, assumed the station of Prime Minister, in consequence of his acceptance of the united posts of First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer. He was opposed by a large section of the House of Commons, which caused a dissolution in March 1786. At a general election which followed, Pitt was again returned to power. He guided the helm of the State during the stormy period of the French Revolution. Pitt died January 23, 1806, having, as was universally acknowledged, given evidence of commanding powers as a financier and orator.

PLUNKET, WILLIAM CONYNGHAM, LORD, was born at Enniskillen, in 1764; he studied at Trinity College, Dublin, and after being called to the bar he was returned as a member for the borough of Charlemont to the Irish House of Commons. After the Irish Parliament was abolished in 1800, he practised at the bar; and in 1803 conducted the prosecution of Emmett; became Solicitor-General for Ireland, and Attorney-General in 1805. He was returned to Parliament as member for Dublin University in 1812, and in 1827 he was raised to the peerage, and made Chief-Justice of the Common Pleas in Ireland. He was appointed Lord Chancellor of Ireland in 1830, which office he held till 1841. His death took place in 1854. As a speaker in Parliament, he was ready, clear, and condensed in style, and an admirable debater.

PULTENEY, WILLIAM, EARL OF BATH, was born in 1682, and received his education at Westminster School and Christ Church, Oxford. On entering Parliament he distinguished himself on the Whig side of politics. Under George I. he was appointed a Privy Councillor and Secretary at War. He helped to conduct a paper which was intended for the annoyance of Sir Robert Walpole. This caused a duel between Pulteney and Lord Hervey. The king caused his name to be struck from the list of Privy Councillors and from the commission of the peace for this act. He became Prime Minister in 1746, after the resignation of Walpole, but held office for two days only. He died in 1764.

ROBERTSON, REV. F. W., the son of Captain F. Robertson of the Royal Artillery, was born in London, February 3, 1816. He was educated at Beverley, Yorkshire, and at Edinburgh Academy. A proficient in classics, with a taste for "heroic daring," he studied law, but eventually, in obedience to his father's wishes, entered Brasenose College, Oxford, to study for the Church. He was successively curate of St Maurice and St Mary, Calendar; of Christ Church, Cheltenham; and of St Ebbes, Oxford. Eventually he became incumbent of Trinity Chapel, Brighton. He died of consumption there, universally regretted, August 15, 1853. His life was one of great purity and unselfish devotion to his work, and his published sermons have been welcomed wherever the English language is understood.

RUSSELL, JOHN, EARL, the third son of John, sixth Duke of Bedford, was born in London, August 18, 1792. He was educated at Harrow and at Westminster School; he also attended Edinburgh University. In 1813 he was returned for Tavistock, in the Liberal interest. He distinguished himself for his advocacy of social and political reform, and as a parliamentary debater and orator. He took part in the debates on the income tax and foreign treaties, and resisted what was called the "Northern Settlement," whereby Norway and Sweden were to be united, and in 1817 spoke strongly against the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. He has represented successively in Parliament, Tavistock, Huntingdonshire, Bandon Bridge, Devonshire, South Devon, Stroud, and London. He was raised to the peerage as Earl Russell in 1869. He has also held the following offices in succession: Paymaster of the Forces, 1830 to 1834; Secretary of State for the Home Department, 1835 to 1839; Secretary of State for the Colonies, 1839 to 1841; First Lord of the Treasury, 1846 to 1852; Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 1852 to 1853; Lord President of the Council, 1854 to 1855; on a special mission to Vienna, 1855; Secretary of State for the Colonies, 1855; Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 1859 to 1861; First Lord of the Treasury, October 23, 1865, to July 6, 1866. During an important and remarkable career he has issued about twenty volumes of varied importance and interest, the last of which, "Recollections and Suggestions, 1813-73," was published in 1875.

SHEIL, RICHARD LALOR, one of the most eminent Irish orators of recent times, was born in 1794. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and at Stonyhurst. After being called to the Irish bar in 1814, he attracted attention as a member of the Catholic Association by his eloquence, and was afterwards elected as Member of Parliament for Milbourne Port. In the House he commanded attention by the vigour, earnestness, and eloquence of his appeals. He attached himself to the Whigs, became Queen's Counsel and Privy Councillor, and afterwards, in succession, a commissioner of Greenwich Hospital, Vice-President of the Board of Trade, Judge-Advocate-General, and Master of the Mint. He died in 1851, at Florence, while acting as minister plenipotentiary.

SHERIDAN, RICHARD BRINSLEY, was born at Dublin in September 1751, and was educated there, and afterwards at Harrow. In his educational career he was looked upon as an "impenetrable dunce." He eloped with Miss Linley, an accomplished singer, and was secretly married to her in France, and again the ceremony was repeated by licence on his return to England in 1773. Between 1775 and 1779 he produced a series of sparkling comedies, of which the "School for Scandal" is best known, ranking as one of the finest wit-comedies in the language. His maiden speech was delivered in the House on the 20th of November 1780, when he was listened to with every mark of respect; but his appearance did not entirely satisfy his friends. In February 1783, Mr Sheridan first came into direct contact with Mr Pitt, who was then Chancellor of the Exchequer. Sheridan's begum speech has always been famous as an extraordinary exhibition of eloquence. It was delivered in the House of Commons in 1787, in connection with the case of Warren Hastings. When the House of Commons resolved to impeach Warren Hastings, Sheridan was chosen as one of the managers. He was called upon to reproduce, as far as possible, his splendid oration of the preceding year. Mr Sheridan always lived and acted without any regular system for the government of his conduct; and for the last few years of his public life he seldom spoke in Parliament. He terminated his political career with a splendid proof of eloquence. This was in 1812, when the overtures for peace which had then recently been made by France were the subject of discussion. Sheridan died in poverty and disgrace, deserted by all save one or two of

his old friends, on Sunday, July 7, 1816, in the sixty-fifth year of his age.

SMITH, SYDNEY, was born in 1771, at the village of Woodford, in Essex. He was educated at Winchester, was elected a scholar of New College, Oxford, in 1780, and a fellow in 1790. After some Continental travel, he obtained the curacy of Nether-Avon, near Amesbury, Wiltshire, which he held for two years, and afterwards became travelling tutor to the son of a country gentleman. He intended going to Weimar with his pupil, but the German war altered his plans, and he came to Edinburgh. In Edinburgh he became acquainted with the set who founded the *Edinburgh Review.* The first number was published in October 1802. In 1804 he went to London, and in 1806 Lord Erskine gave him the rectory of Foston-le-Clay, in Yorkshire. In 1828 Lord Lyndhurst presented him to a stall in Bristol Cathedral, and in a year or two afterwards he left Foston for the rectory of Combe-Florey, in Somersetshire. In 1831 he was appointed one of the canons residentiary of St Paul's Cathedral by Earl Grey. He died in London, February 21, 1845.

SOUTH, ROBERT, was born in London in 1633. He attended Westminster School, and in 1658 he took orders, and attracted so much attention that he was chosen public orator of the university, and afterwards became chaplain to the Earl of Clarendon, prebendary of Westminster, canon of Christ Church, and rector of Islip, in Oxfordshire. He declined the bishopric of Rochester and the deanery of Westminster. While at the university, he was of unsettled opinions, but after the Restoration he became a steady supporter of the High Church. He died in 1716, and was buried in Westminster Abbey, close by his old master, Dr Busby.

SPURGEON, CHARLES HADDON, one of the most popular of living preachers, was born at Kelvedon, Essex, June 19, 1834. His father was John Spurgeon, second son of the Rev. James Spurgeon, who was pastor of a small Independent church at Colchester. His mother was the youngest sister of Charles Parker Jarvis, of Colchester, and a woman of remarkable piety. His earlier years were spent with his grandfather at Stambourne, in Essex. He was educated at Colchester, and, while at school, displayed a passionate fondness for reading; became usher in a school at Newmarket. He joined a congregation presided over by the late Robert Hall, Cambridge; and soon afterwards he appeared as a village preacher and tract distributor at Faversham, near Cambridge. His audiences knew him by the title of the "boy preacher." He was first called to a Baptist congregation at Waterbeach, when but seventeen years of age; and crowds went to hear him. He was next, in 1853, offered New Park Street Chapel, Southwark, but so great was his popularity that within two years it had to be enlarged; and while this was in progress they worshipped in Exeter Hall and the Surrey Music Hall. At length the Baptist Tabernacle in Newington Butts was built for him and his ever-increasing congregation, which was opened in 1861. The membership of the Metropolitan Tabernacle now numbers over five thousand. Mr Spurgeon is an indefatigable worker, and takes a hearty interest in the Pastors' College and the Stockwell Orphanage. Besides other channels of publication, there is a weekly issue of his sermons, which, begun January 7, 1855, has continued till the present time, and has a very large circulation. He is editor of a magazine called *Sword and Trowel.* Of his separate publications, his "Commentary on the Psalms," "Daily Readings," "Feathers for Arrows," and "John Ploughman's Talk," are the most important.

STANLEY, THE REV. ARTHUR PENHRYN, D.D., was born about 1815, and educated under Dr Arnold at Rugby, and at Balliol College, Oxford. He distinguished himself at college, obtaining a scholarship, the Newdigate prize for an English poem, a first-class in classics in 1837, the Latin essay prize in 1839, and the English essay and theological prizes in 1840. In 1851 he became Canon of Westminster; from 1858 to 1864 he filled the posts of Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford, Canon of Christ Church, and chaplain to the Bishop of London. In 1864 he became Dean of Westminster. He was author of the well-known "Life of Dr Arnold of Rugby" (1844), and many other works of importance. He received the degree of LL.D. in 1871. He was elected one of the select preachers at Oxford in 1872, and installed Lord Rector of St Andrews University in 1875. Of an address to the students of St Andrews a small portion is quoted in the present work. He died 18th July 1881.

STERNE, LAURENCE, was born at Clonmel, in Ireland, in 1713. He was sent to school at Halifax, and to Jesus College, Cambridge. His uncle obtained for him the living of Sutton, and a prebendal stall at York. In 1759 he was presented to the living of Coxwold. The publication of the first portion of "Tristram Shandy" in 1759, and the remaining parts during an interval of six years, rendered him suddenly famous. He visited London, mixed in good society, and spent more than two years in France and Italy. The result of his Continental travels was the publication of the "Sentimental Journey" in 1768, in which year he died. His sermons, preached after his reputation as a humorist had gone abroad, have been censured, as too easy-going, and accommodating to the follies and fashions of the time.

STRAFFORD, THOMAS WENTWORTH, EARL OF, the famous minister of Charles I., was born at London in 1593. He was educated at Cambridge, and in 1611 was knighted, and travelled on the Continent. He entered Parliament as member for Yorkshire in 1614, and represented that county in several parliaments. In 1623 he sided with the king, and was created Baron Wentworth, then viscount, Lord President of the Council of the North, and a Privy Councillor in 1629. He was made Lord Deputy of Ireland in 1633. The despotic nature of his government is supposed to have led to the rebellion of 1641. He helped, however, to encourage the introduction of the growth of flax, and the establishment of linen manufactures. He was created Earl of Strafford in 1639, receiving the title of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. On taking his seat in the House of Lords in November 1640, he was impeached for high treason. His trial caused the greatest excitement all over the country; the whole House of Commons was present, along with commissioners from Scotland and Ireland, eighty peers as judges, and with the king and queen as lookers-on. Unaided against thirteen accusers, he argued the charges which they brought forward for seventeen days. The impeachment was at one time likely to fail, when, the king at last giving his assent to the attainder, he was beheaded on Tower Hill, May 12, 1641.

SWIFT, DR JONATHAN, Dean of St Patrick's, was born at Dublin in 1667. He attended school at Kilkenny, and next went to Trinity College, Dublin, where he applied himself particularly to the study of history and poetry, to the neglect of other branches of learning. Losing his uncle in 1688, and his thoughts being directed to the Church, he came to England and waited upon Sir William Temple, through whose influence, and that of Lord Berkeley, he obtained the livings of Laracor and Rathbiggan, to the former of which he went to reside. In 1701 he took his doctor's degree, and began publishing his political pamphlets, the most celebrated of which are the "Tale of a Tub," and the "Battle of the Books." While in London he was a chief contributor to the *Examiner*. As a writer and speaker the works of Swift are among the best specimens we possess of a thorough English style. Sinking into absolute idiocy, Swift died in 1745, aged seventy-seven, after bequeathing the greater part of his fortune to an hospital for lunatics.

TAYLOR, JEREMY, was born at Cambridge, where his father was a barber, August 15, 1613. At thirteen he entered Caius College, took the degree of B.A. in 1631, was chosen fellow of his college, and at twenty-one he was ordained. On removing to London, Archbishop Laud assisted him in obtaining a fellowship at All Souls College, Oxford. Bishop Juxon appointed him to the living of Uppingham in 1637. During the Commonwealth he fared badly, as he was attached to the cause and fortunes of Charles I. He was made Bishop of Down and Connor at the Restoration, and in his office laboured unceasingly, until his death at Lisburne in 1667. His best known works are his "Manual of Devotion," "Holy Living and Dying," and his "Sermons." His sermons display great learning, fine fancy, and a powerful imagination.

THOMSON, DR ANDREW, one of the most famous divines and debaters in the Scotch Church, was born at Sanquhar, Dumfriesshire, in 1779. He was ordained minister of Sprouston, in the Presbytery of Kelso, in 1802, and removed to the East Church, Perth, in 1808. In 1810 he was presented to the New Greyfriars Church, Edinburgh, and in 1814 he was translated to St George's Church, in that city. It was in public debates, and in the annual meetings of the General Assembly of the Church, where the full force of his eloquence, and where the zeal and ardour of his nature, were best exemplified. He took an active public part in the question of the abolition of slavery in our colonies. His work was very suddenly brought to a close while in the prime of life. He dropped down dead suddenly at his own door, in 1831.

THURLOW, EDWARD, LORD, Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, was born in Suffolk in 1732. He was educated at Canterbury School and Cambridge University. In 1754 he was called to the bar. He represented Tamworth in Parliament in 1768, was appointed Solicitor-General in 1770, and in the following year Attorney-General. He supported Lord North's policy, and became very popular with George III. He was appointed Lord Chancellor in 1778; with one short period excepted, held office till 1792, when Pitt's hostility compelled him to resign. He died at Brighton in 1806.

TILLOTSON, JOHN, was born at Sowerby, Yorkshire, in October 1630. He was educated at Clare Hall, Cambridge. At the Restoration he became chaplain to Charles II., and was presented to a prebend of Canterbury. In 1672 he was advanced to the deanery of Canterbury, and obtained a prebend in St Paul's. After the Revolution he was appointed clerk of the closet, under William III., and raised to the see of Canterbury in 1691. He died in 1694. The copyright of his "Sermons," which produced £2500, was all the provision he left for his widow, who was a niece of Oliver Cromwell. His sermons were at one time very popular, and ranked as examples of the most finished oratory.

WALPOLE, SIR ROBERT, EARL OF ORFORD, Prime Minister of England, was born at Hough-

ton, in Norfolk, in 1676. He was educated at Eton and Cambridge. In 1701 he appeared in Parliament, as member for Castle Rising, and in 1702 he represented Lynn. He was appointed Secretary of War in 1708, and Treasurer of the Navy in 1709. When the Whig ministry was dissolved he was committed to the Tower on a charge of corruption and breach of trust. On the accession of George I., he was made Paymaster of the Forces, and afterwards Prime Minister. He resigned in 1717, but again accepted office as Paymaster of the Forces in 1720. He was again created Premier on the retirement of Lord Sunderland, and continued in office for about twenty years. He resigned in 1742, and was created Earl of Orford. He died in 1745.

WESLEY, JOHN, was born at Epworth in 1703. While at Oxford University in 1730, along with his brother and some other students, they formed themselves into a religious society, and for this they were called Methodists. Wesley visited Georgia, in America, in 1735, with a view of converting the Indians; and after a stay of two years, returned to England, and for a short time joined with Whitefield as an itinerant preacher; but differing on the doctrine of election, they separated. The churches closed their doors against him, but spacious meeting-houses were built for him in London, Bristol, and other towns. He travelled many times over England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, preaching and organising churches. He published many volumes, consisting of hymns, sermons, political tracts, and controversial treatises. Wesley died March 2, 1791, in the eighty-ninth year of his age.

WHITFIELD, OR WHITEFIELD, GEORGE, was the son of an innkeeper at Gloucester, and born in 1714. While at Pembroke College, Oxford, he became associated with the Wesleys, and on being ordained, soon became a popular preacher. He interested himself in the American settlement of Georgia, which he visited in 1738, and on his return to England he assisted in procuring subscriptions for an orphan-house in the settlement. On his return to London, his preaching became so popular that no house could contain the assembled multitudes, and so he adopted the plan of preaching in the open air. He again visited America in 1739, where he addressed large audiences, returning in 1741. A difference with Wesley on the doctrine of election led to a separation, without, however, destroying any friendly feeling. In 1748 he was chosen chaplain to the Countess of Huntingdon. He made preaching tours in various parts of England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland; and on again visiting America, died at Newbury Port, in New England, September 30, 1770. "Whitefield," says one, "was the prince of English preachers. Many have surpassed him as sermon-makers, but none have approached him as a pulpit orator. Many have outshone him in the clearness of their logic, the grandeur of their conceptions, and the sparkling beauty of single sentences, but in the power of darting the Gospel direct into the conscience, he eclipsed them all. With an open, beaming countenance, and a frank and easy port, he combined a voice of rich compass, and to these advantages he added a most expressive and eloquent action. Improved by conscientious practice, and instinct with his earnest nature, this elocution was the acted sermon, and by its pantomimic portrait enabled the eye to anticipate each rapid utterance, and helped the memory to treasure up the palpable ideas."

WILBERFORCE, WILLIAM, was born at Hull in 1759, and completed his education at Cambridge. He entered Parliament as member for his native town in his twenty-fifth year. His way of living was at first in keeping with the fashionable world around him, but when travelling with Dean Milner on the Continent, he became seriously impressed with the truths of Christianity. Henceforth his former gaieties were abandoned, and the whole powers of his nature were for twenty years directed towards the abolition of the slave trade. This was finally decreed by the British legislature in 1807. He died, aged seventy-three, in 1833. His "Practical View of the prevailing Religious Systems of Professed Christians" was extremely popular, and was published to counteract the infidel notion prevalent in society at the period of the French Revolution.

WILKES, JOHN, was born in London in 1727. He received a good education, and, after travelling on the Continent for some time, he married a lady of fortune, and became a colonel in the Buckinghamshire Militia. In 1761, when elected M.P. for Aylesbury, on account of a libel which he printed in the *North Briton*, a warrant was issued for his apprehension, and he was committed to the Tower. When on trial he was dismissed by Chief-Justice Pratt, who decided that general warrants were illegal. He, however, incurred another prosecution, on account of the publication of an obscene poem, entitled an "Essay on Women." On his non-appearance to receive judgment he was outlawed, when he went to France, where he resided till 1768, in which year he was elected for Middlesex. Instead, however, of taking his seat, he was committed to King's Bench Prison. His committal gave rise to serious riots in St George's Fields. A large subscription was raised to pay his debts. In 1774 he was elected Mayor of London, and in the same year he entered Parliament as member for Middlesex without opposition. He died in 1797.

INDEX.

AFRICA, progress of exploration in, 300.
America, on conciliation with—Burke, 197.
——, right of taxing, discussed—Lord Chatham, 139.
American taxation—Burke, 174.
Army, motion for reducing the—Pulteney, 116.
ATTERBURY, FRANCIS, 103-106.

BARROW, ISAAC, 90-92.
BAXTER, RICHARD, 87-89.
BEACONSFIELD, LORD, 427-445.
Begum charge, on summing up evidence—Sheridan, 262.
Bishop, office of the most diligent—Latimer, 13.
BELHAVEN, LORD, 98, 103.
BLAIR, HUGH, 160-164.
Bonaparte, fall of—Canning, 321.
Books, the friendship of—Maurice, 410.
BRIGHT, JOHN, 470-487.
Bristol election—Burke, 222-240.
British foreign policy—Palmerston, 352.
BROUGHAM, LORD, 332-343.
Buckingham, impeachment of—Eliot, 45.
Burgesses, the, of London—Latimer, 11.
Burials Bill, the—Bright, 480.
BURKE, EDMUND, 169-240.
Burke, Edmund—Maurice, 418.

CANNING, GEORGE, 321-328.
Capernaum—Doddridge, 123.
Card, the, to play—Latimer, 16.
CARLYLE, THOMAS, 364-374.
Carlyle on Cromwell, 51.
—— on Edward Irving, 355.
CHALMERS, THOMAS, 346-352.
CHATHAM, LORD, 136-143.
CHESTERFIELD, LORD, 117-123.
City, the, its sins and sorrows—Guthrie, 386.
COBBETT, WILLIAM, 314-316.
COBDEN, RICHARD, 394-402.
Colonial slavery—O'Connell, 331.
Copyright—Macaulay, 383.
Corry, invective against Mr—Grattan, 257.
Crimean war, the—Bright, 470.
CROMWELL, OLIVER, 51-64.
CURRAN, JOHN PHILPOT, 254-253.

DERBY, EARL OF, 381.
Devil, the, a diligent preacher—Latimer, 13.
DICKENS, CHARLES, 488-497.
DISRAELI, BENJAMIN, 427-445.
Dissenters' Relief Bill—Burke, 169.
Dissolution of Parliament—Derby, 381.
Divine grace and holy obedience—Leighton, 80.
DODDRIDGE, PHILIP, 123-127.
DONNE, JOHN, 35-42.

Education—J. A. Froude, 511.
Elect, the, certainty and perpetuity of faith in Hooker, 30.
Elect, the—Donne, 41.
ELIOT, SIR JOHN, 44-49.
Emmett—Lord Plunket, 317.
ERSKINE, LORD, 259-262.
Examples how far to be followed—Fuller, 64.
Exhortations to candidates for the degree of M.A.—Leighton, 84.

Fortune, man at the mercy of—South, 97
Fox, C. J., character of—Mackintosh, 319.
FOX, CHARLES JAMES, 241-254.
——, Mackintosh on, 319.
France, rupture of negotiations with—Pitt, 305.
French invasion, the threatened—Robert Hall 313.
Friendships, human and divine—South, 96.
FROUDE, JAMES ANTHONY, 511-521.
FULLER, THOMAS, 64-69.

Gin Act—Lord Chesterfield, 117.
GLADSTONE, W. E., 445-470.
God's goodness to man—Irving, 361.
God's vineyard—J. Hall, 42.
Good, the doing of—Tillotson, 93.
Goodness—Barrow, 90.
GOUGH, J. B., 509-511.
Grace, free—Wesley, 127.
GRATTAN, HENRY, 256-258.
GREY, EARL, 316, 317.
GUTHRIE, THOMAS, 386-394.

HALL, JOSEPH, 42-44.
HALL, ROBERT, 307-314.
HAMILTON, JOHN (Lord Belhaven), 98-103.
Heaven—Donne, 35.
—— on earth—Kingsley, 522.
——, emblems of—Irving, 362.
HOOKER, RICHARD, 30-35.
Household, serving God in the—Irving, 355.
Husband's power, a—Taylor, 75, 76.
Hull, speech to the electors of—Wilberforce. 306.

Impeachment of Strafford, 49.
Inaugural discourse—Brougham, 332.
Industry, incitement to—Barrow, 91.
Infidelity—Thomson, 345.
Ireland, the state of—Sheil, 376.
Irish Church, the—Disraeli, 427.
—— —Gladstone, 445.
Irish Disturbances Bill—O'Connell, 331.
Irish parliamentary reform—Curran, 254.
Irish rights, on moving a declaration of—Grattan. 256.
IRVING, EDWARD, 355-363.

JEWELL, DR JOHN. 26-30.

King, motion for a removal of the—Walpole, 109.
KINGSLEY, CHARLES, 522-524.
Knowledge, the pursuit of—Disraeli, 433.
Knowledge, advantages to lower classes—Hall, 307.
KNOX, JOHN, 18-26.

LATIMER, HUGH, 9-17.
Law Reform—Brougham, 341.
LEIGHTON, ROBERT, 80-86.
London, iniquity of—Latimer, 11.
Lords, speech before the House of—Atterbury, 103.
LYNDHURST, LORD, 329, 330.
LYTTON, LORD, 402-409.

MACAULAY, LORD, 383-385.
MACKINTOSH, SIR JAMES, 318-320.
MACLEOD, NORMAN, 497-500.
Man, creation of—Irving, 362.
Man, the dignity of—Tillotson, 92.
MANSFIELD, LORD, 133-136.
Marriage Ring, the—Jeremy Taylor, 70.
Mass, the—Bishop Jewell, 26.
Match, an ill, well broken off—Fuller, 67.
MAURICE, F. D., 410-427.
Mind, knowledge and liberality of—Irving, 363.
Missions to India—Macleod, 497.
Mourning, house of—Sterne, 149.
MURRAY, WILLIAM (Lord Mansfield), 133-136.
Music in church—Atterbury, 105.

Nation, state of the—Eliot, 48.
Now or never—Baxter, 88.

O'CONNELL, DANIEL, 331, 332.

PALMERSTON, LORD, 352, 353.
Parliament, speech on dissolving—Cromwell, 63.
Parliamentary reform, 326, 342.
PEEL, SIR ROBERT, 353-355.
Peace and war—Bright, 482.
Peers, a bill to deprive, of privileges—Mansfield, 134.
Peltier, defence of Jean—Mackintosh, 318.
PITT, WILLIAM (Lord Chatham), 136-148.
——, reply to Walpole, 138.
——, WILLIAM, 292-306.
Ploughers, the—Latimer, 9.
PLUNKET, LORD, 317, 318.
Policy, the right, of Britain—Canning, 327.
Prayer, on—Knox, 18; Barrow, 91.
Preaching—Gladstone, 466.
Prelates, unpreaching—Latimer, 12.
Press and pulpit—Irving, 362.
Property of husband and wife—Taylor, 74.
PULTENEY, WILLIAM, 116, 117.

Reform Bill, the—Russell, 375; on moving the second reading of—Earl Grey, 316.
Reform and reformers—Cobbett, 314.
Rejoicing, right—Baxter, 87.
Representation of the people—Wilkes, 165.
Ring, the marriage—Taylor, 70.
ROBERTSON, F. W., 504-509.
RUSSELL, LORD JOHN, 375.
Russia and Turkey—Gladstone, 469.
Russia, war with—Cobden, 396.
Russian and Turkish treaties—Sheil, 376.
Russian armament, the—Fox, 241.

Seamen, against search-warrants for—Chatham, 136.
Seeing God—Donne, 36.
Sermons—their matter—Spurgeon, 524.
Session, review of the—Lyndhurst, 329.
SHEIL, RICHARD LALOR, 376-381.
SHERIDAN, RICHARD BRINSLEY, 262-291.
Sin, sermon on—Donne, 37.
Slave emancipation—Thomson, 343.
Slave trade—Pitt, 292.
SMITH, SYDNEY, 328, 329.
Social responsibilities—Gough, 510.
SOUTH, DR ROBERT, 96-98.
Spaniard, the, enemy of England—Cromwell, 52.
SPURGEON, C. H., 524-526.
STANHOPE, PHILIP DORMER (Lord Chesterfield), 117-123.
STANLEY, A. P., 500-504.
State of the nation—Cromwell, 51.
——, the, and religion—Eliot, 44.
STERNE, LAURENCE, 149-152.
Stockdale, John, speech on behalf of—Lord Erskine, 259.
STRAFFORD, EARL OF, 49-51.
St John—Stanley, 502.
St Paul—Stanley, 500.
Students of Edinburgh, address to the—Carlyle, 364.
SWIFT, JONATHAN, 107-109.
Sympathy of Christ—Robertson, 504.
Sympathy for man—Chalmers, 346.

Tamworth, speech at—Peel, 353.
Taxation, American—Burke, 174.
TAYLOR, JEREMY, 70-80.
Temperance, the cause of—Gough, 509.
Theology, hopes of—Stanley, 503.
THOMSON, DR ANDREW, 343-345.
THURLOW, LORD, 240.
TILLOTSON, JOHN, 92-96.
Time, the flight of—Chalmers, 351.
Trinity, doctrine of—Swift, 107.
Turks, the great, to discomfort and thrust down—Latimer, 17.

Union between England and Scotland—Lord Belhaven, 98.

Virgins, the wise and foolish—Whitefield, 152.

WALPOLE, SIR ROBERT, 109-115.
WENTWORTH, THOMAS, 49-51.
WESLEY, JOHN, 127-133.
WHITEFIELD, GEORGE, 152-159.
WILBERFORCE, WILLIAM, 306, 307.
WILKES, JOHN, 165-169.
Williams, Thomas, speech on—Lord Erskine, 259.
Women, education of—Kingsley, 523.
Wordsworth—Robertson, 507.
World, another—Irving, 363.
World, fashions of—Hall, 43.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED, EDINBURGH

SRI PRATAP COLLEGE
SRINAGAR
LIBRARY

Class No.
Book No.
Accession No.

825 C66T

SRI PRATAP COLLEGE LIBRARY,
SRINAGAR. (Kashmir)

DATE LOANED 1375

A fine of .06 nP. will be charged for each day the book is kept over-time.

825 C66T

13175.

Date. Card No. Date. Card No.

SRI PRATAP COLLEGE
LIBRARY,
SRINAGAR.

Members of College Teaching Staff can borrow ten books at a time and can retain these for one month.

Any intermediate student of the college can borrow one book at a time, any Degree or Honours or Post-Graduate students of the college, two books at a time and these can retain for 14 days.

Books in any way injured or lost shall be paid for or replaced by the borrower.